ERIC Document Resume | **See Instruction Sheet** | **DATE OF RESUME** | **DATE RECEIVED**

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER: ED002688
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).: N.A.
3. IDENTIFICATION NO.: N.A.
4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.
5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops
6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.
7. EDITOR(S): N.A.
9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth, Subcom. on the Migrant Child, Sacramento 14, Calif.

Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth, Subcommittee on the Migrant Child, 401 State Bldg. No. 1, Sacramento, California

10. VOL.: N.A.
11. PAGES: N.A.
12. MO./YR.: 2/64
13. TOTAL PP.: 53

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT:
- PROPOSAL ☐
- IN-PROGRESS ☐
- FINAL ☒
- FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA:
15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: report
16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

farm employers	migrants	migrant education	housing	sanitation	health
living standards	wages	community action	poverty	mechanization	
day care centers		foreign workers			

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A conference was held to examine the realities of problems of migrant workers from the points of view of the grower, the worker, the consumer, and the State of California.

The trend has been toward mechanizing agriculture, ceasing the importation of Braceros and other foreign labor, and recruiting many new families to agriculture for domestic work. The problems of temporary employment involve a low income; the lack of stable, permanent homes; and a lack of communication between crews and employers.

The Federal Government and State Governmentscan take responsibility for improving conditions through legislation and other means. Rearranging and strengthening migratory routes and taking steps to assure farm workers of their fair share of the national prosperity should be undertaken. Efforts to improve housing, sanitation, health, wages, education, fringe benefits, living standard, and the incentive gap between agriculture and industry are needed. Suggested measures for improvement include provision of a community development worker to help citizens organize neighborhood councils for self-improvement, a voter registration campaign, and the redirection of existing resources by public and private agencies into community development programs.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION
20. DIVISION OR DEPT.
21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT
23. DURATION OF PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ED002688

Fourth Annual CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES WHO FOLLOW THE CROPS

BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA — FEBRUARY 27, 28, 1964

REPORT and RECOMMENDATIONS

GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE MIGRANT CHILD

401 State Building No. 1
Sacramento 14, California

THE CENTER FOR CULTURAL STUDIES
Adams State College of Colorado
Alamosa

Jc 606

ED002688

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

1964 SPONSORS

R. E. ANDREWS
Farmer
Clovis

RAYMOND B. AUKER
Fresno Community Council

DONALD J. BALLINGER
Community Worker
North Avenue Center, Fresno

THOMAS A. BELL
Director
Kern County Welfare
Department

HARRY BLAIR
Kern County Superintendent
of Schools

CARLOS F. BORJA, JR.
President
Council of Mexican-American
Affairs

LUADA BOSWELL
National Field Staff
Girls Scouts of the U. S. A.

DE WITTE BOYD, M.D.
Kern County Health Officer

A. FRANK BREWER, M.D.
Merced County Health Officer

W. L. BROWN, M.D.
Fresno

DR. MILTON CHERNIN
Berkeley

SIDNEY L. CRUFF
Farmer
Selma

LELA MAE DUKE
Member and Steward
Agricultural Workers
Organizing Committee,
AFL-CIO
Strathmore

JOHN N. DUNGAN
Tulare County Farmers
Association
Exeter

EYVINDE FAYE
President, Sunsweet Growers
Knights Landing

REV. FATHER JAMES B. FLYNN
General Director, Catholic
Charities
Archdiocese of San Francisco

MRS. J. C. GOBLE
San Jose

ALLAN GRANT
President
California Farm Bureau
Federation

THE REV. WAYNE C.
HARTMIRE, JR.
Director, California Migrant
Ministry

NEWTON D. HOLCOMB
Director
Santa Clara County Welfare
Department

JOHN HOLT
Chairman, Kern County Board
of Supervisors

MRS. PHYLLIS KELLOGG
Sutter

DANIEL E. KOSHLAND
San Francisco

GEORGE I. KRELL
Oakland

GILBERT LOPEZ
President, Community Service
Organization

HELEN R. MacGREGOR
Vice Chairman, Governor's
Advisory Committee on
Children and Youth

BARD McALLISTER
Farm Labor Secretary
American Friends Service
Committee

DR. DAVIS McENTIRE
Berkeley

ALAN MILNER
President, Fresno
Community Council

TOM O'NEILL
Farmer
Five Points

WILLIAM T. O'REAR
Secretary, Central Labor
Council
Fresno and Madera Counties

B. R. PACKER, M. D.
Fresno

HELEN PHELAN
Catholic Social Service
Watsonville

THOMAS L. PITTS
Secretary-Treasurer
California Labor Federation,
AFL-CIO

DOMER F. POWER
Citrus and Olive Grower
Strathmore

THE REV. BRUNO E. PUESCHEL
Minister, First Congregational Church
Wasco

HENRY RIBLE
Director Kings County Welfare
Department

ANTHONY P. RIOS
Los Angeles

SIDNEY ROSIN, M.D.
Los Angeles

VIOLET ROTAN
Farm Worker
Plainview

EARL ROUSE
Director, City of Wasco Housing
Authority

THE REV. PAUL SHELFORD
Executive Director
Northern California Council of Churches

THE REV. JOHN G. SIMMONS
Chairman, Emergency Committee to
Aid Farm Workers

CHARLES SMITH, M.D.
Berkeley

LEOPOLD J. SNYDER, M.D.
Chairman, Rural Health Committee,
California Medical Association;
Member, Council on Rural Health,
American Medical Association

HON CARLOS M. TERAN
Judge of the Superior Court
Los Angeles

J. POST WILLIAMS
Tulare County Superintendent of Schools

MRS. W. W. WOOD
President, California Congress of
Parents and Teachers, Inc.

MRS. HUBERT WYCKOFF
Governor's Advisory Committee on
Children and Youth

LOUIS ZARATE
Juvenile Probation Officer
Santa Clara County

EDMUND G. BROWN
GOVERNOR

GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH
401 State Building No. 1
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

MRS. HUBERT WYCKOFF, *Chairman*
Watsonville
MISS HELEN MacGREGOR
Oakland
HEMAN G. STARK, *Executive Officer*
Sacramento
ROY C. VOTAW, *Executive Secretary*
Sacramento
SANDRA AGEE, Long Beach
ROBERT BRUCE ANDERSON, Claremont
DR. RICHMOND BARBOUR, San Diego
LOREN A. BECKLEY, Belmont
JERRY BREWER, Gridley
WINSTON S. CARTER, Glendale
MRS. PAULYN CLARK, Los Angeles
HON. MELVYN I. CRONIN, San Francisco
HON. VINCENT S. DALSIMER, Los Angeles
ROBERT N. DAVIDSON, Turlock
MRS. ERNEST E. DEBS, Los Angeles
REV. JAMES B. FLYNN, San Francisco
MRS. DOROTHY M. FORD, Los Angeles
BERTRAM H. GOLD, Los Angeles
MILTON L. GOLDBERG, Los Angeles
MRS. CHARLES P. GOULD, San Marino
MRS. EARL J. HAZELTON, Orland
GEORGE HJELTE, Los Angeles
MRS. OPAL C. JONES, Los Angeles
LEOPOLDO R. LOPEZ, Pittsburg
HON. WILLIAM B. McKESSON, Los Angeles
BARD McALLISTER, Visalia
JAMES MORTON, Palm Springs
WILLIAM NELSON, El Cerrito
HON. A. EDWARD NICHOLS, Los Angeles
MRS. JEANADA NOLAN, Sacramento
WILLIAM T. O'REAR, Fresno
MRS. A. BOYD PUCCINELLI, San Francisco
RABBI SANFORD E. ROSEN, San Mateo
DR. SIDNEY ROSIN, Beverly Hills
HOWARD ROURKE, Ventura
REV. PAUL SHELFORD, San Francisco
MISS ELIZABETH SHERMAN, Fresno
MRS. ANTONIO SILVA, Concord
MISS GAIL SINTON, Palo Alto
MRS. FREDERIC W. SPENCER, North Hollywood
MRS. KATE STERN, Los Angeles
DR. RALPH TYLER, Stanford
VICTOR D. VIEIRA, Berkeley
DR. HENRY J. WEGROCKI, Los Angeles
MRS. W. W. WOOD, Marysville
LOUIS ZARATE, San Jose

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS
TOM BRIGHT
Director, State Department of Motor Vehicles
HALE CHAMPION
Director, State Department of Finance
CHARLES DeTURK
Director, State Department of Parks and Recreation
JOHN F. FISHER
Executive Officer, State Personnel Board
DR. MALCOLM H. MERRILL
Director, State Department of Public Health
STANLEY MOSK
Attorney General
DR. JOHN PORTERFIELD
Acting Director, State Department of Mental Hygiene
DR. MAX RAFFERTY
Director, State Department of Education
AL TIEBERG
Director, State Department of Employment
ERNEST B. WEBB
Director, State Department of Industrial Relations
JOHN M. WEDEMEYER
Director, State Department of Social Welfare

STAFF COMMITTEE
HAROLD J. FRAULOB, *Chairman*
State Department of Motor Vehicles
CHARLES E. PEMBERTON, *Vice Chairman*
State Department of Finance
FRANK MESPLE
Governor's Office
DR. WILLIAM B. BEACH, JR.
State Department of Mental Hygiene
RALPH D. COOK
State Personnel Board
DR. LESLIE CORSA
State Department of Public Health
LAWRENCE J. FORD
State Department of Industrial Relations
MRS. AILEEN C. HERNANDEZ
State Department of Industrial Relations
ROBERT H. HILL
State Department of Employment
CHARLES A. JAMES
State Department of Justice
MISS LUCILE KENNEDY
State Department of Social Welfare
WILLIAM McCREARY
State Department of Education
DR. BELLE DALE POOLE
State Department of Public Health
GEORGE SALEEBEY
State Department of the Youth Authority
NATHAN SLOATE
State Department of Mental Hygiene
MISS GLADYS SNYDER
State Department of Parks and Recreation
MRS. ESTHER SPENCER
State Department of Public Health

May 20, 1964

Honorable Edmund G. Brown
Governor of California
Sacramento, California

Dear Governor Brown,

Your Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth herewith submits the final report of the Fourth Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops, held in Bakersfield on February 27 and 28, 1964. Your Committee was one of fifty sponsors who convened the Conference and contributed time, effort and resources to its planning and execution.

The Rosenberg Foundation encouraged the Conference again this year with a grant of $1000.00 for expenses for farm workers and $500.00 toward other Conference expenses. Contributions also came from farmers, farm workers, the California Congress of Parents and Teachers and others, making the Conference a partnership of public and private agencies and individuals.

This year a new effort was made to involve both farmers and farm workers in every stage of the program planning right from the start. It was not easy because of the pressure of seasonal farm work, but it improved communication between all parties. Of the 434 registered participants, 64 were farm workers and 101 were growers.

The attached recommendations came from the Study Groups which met for two days seeking areas of agreement. These will be sent to the sponsors for their study and action. Your Advisory Committee is now considering its own part and will make special recommendations to you concerning farm workers' children.

The principal value of these Conferences appears to be the substantial involvement in the planning process of those for whom plans are being made, and doing it continuously and in good faith. Without your own understanding and interest in the families who follow the crops none of this would have been possible. You have our warmest appreciation for your encouragement in this effort to help our farm workers become self-supporting, accepted members of the farm community and to enable their children to grow into strong, healthy good citizens of America.

Respectfully submitted,

Florence R Wyckoff

Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff, Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MAJOR ADDRESSES (As Condensed): PAGE

Our Past Accomplishments
Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff, Chairman
Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth 1

Our Fourth Conference
Mr. Bard McAllister, Governor's Advisory Committee
on Children and Youth; Chairman of the Sub-Committee on
the Migrant Child 2

Trends in California Agriculture
M.L. Peterson, Dean, School of Agriculture,
University of California, Berkeley 4

The Federal Government and the Farm Worker
Mr. Jack Howard, Special Assistant to the
Under-Secretary of Labor, Washington, D.C. 10

The State and the Farm Worker
Mr. Frank Mesple', Secretary to the Governor's
Cabinet, Sacramento 15

Our Common Challenge
Albin Gruhn, President, California Labor Federation
and
Allan Grant, President, California Farm Bureau Federation . . 22

Reality, Responsibility, Respect
Mr. Winslow Christian, Administrator
Health and Welfare Agency, State of California, Sacramento . 28

The Challenge Ahead
Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff 30

Reports and Recommendations of the Study Groups: 33
Community Development 35
Education 41
Employee-Employer Relations 53
Health 74
Housing 80
Social Services 87

Appendices:
I A History of the California Conference on
Families Who Follow the Crops 90

II Participants at the Fourth Annual Conference 93

OUR PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS

by

Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff, Chairman
Governor's Advisory Committee
on Children and Youth

On behalf of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth and the co-sponsors of this Conference, I wish to welcome you here today and to thank the many friendly people of Kern County who have extended such a cordial welcome to us.

We know that many people come here with a great desire to learn about others. They come in good faith and try to communicate with others who live differently and have different values. This is not easy. It takes patience and maturity to overcome the high barriers of ignorance that lie between all of us. We come here with conflicting interests but we may be able to find a number of areas in which we can agree to cooperate. These ways can only be discovered by talking to each other. We hope that each of us will find a useful learning process here and go away with greater wisdom and judgment.

These are tense times. We hope we can keep emotions from clouding the issues so that practical means can be developed to achieve desirable ends. Remember, you are the ones to whom all credit goes for any accomplishments. Yours are the action groups--this Conference is not. This Conference is intended to follow the old adage:

It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness.

OUR FOURTH CONFERENCE

by

Bard McAllister, Governor's Advisory Committee
on Children and Youth; Chairman of the Sub-
Committee on the Migrant Child

We have gathered here today to talk about very important issues in the lives of very important people. Historically, agriculture has been the backbone of our great nation. When many of you were born, one farmer could feed only seven others; now the work of one farmer can feed twenty-four others. Agriculture is losing its place of dominance in both economic and political life.

California is the kitchen garden of the nation. This supreme place was gained because of certain natural factors, and a human factor: favorable climate, fertile soil, abundant water, and an oversupply of low-priced labor. Time brings changes. Smog is affecting the climate; cities are encroaching upon the fertile soil; water supplies are being strained. Many fear that as this year proceeds the ready supply of low-priced labor will be shut off.

This change in the human factor may be as significant to agriculture as the invention of the steam engine was to the industrial revolution. The true significance of the industrial revolution was not so much the advent of power as it was the advent of administered prices. The termination of supplemental foreign labor can add a new dimension to agribusiness: a recognition of the role of the worker in production. It has been stated that agriculture had no labor problems until the church workers, the do-gooders, and the visionaries started meddling. This is to be compared with the statement of my South Carolina friend who told me there was no race problem until Eleanor Roosevelt got into the White House.

Your presence at this Fourth Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops attests to the fact that there are human problems associated with agribusiness. The Conference has been, and I hope it will continue to be, a place where people concerned with such problems can gather to gain insight and share thinking. The Conference is not an arena or a battleground where opposing forces can stage their skirmishes. Nor, should it be the forum from which ideologies are sounded. Rather, the Conference is designed as a workshop for creatively harnessing the constructive forces of tension.

We are gathered to:

1. Examine the reality of the situation: what are the facts as seen by the grower? the laborer? the consumer? and the State?

2. Face our responsibilities to one another: honest pay for honest work, necessary health services, equal educational opportunities and adequate housing.

3. Respect each other as individuals having human emotions, desires, aspirations and integrity.

I opened with the statement that we are here to talk about important issues in the lives of very important people. Let me tell a true story by way of defining the phrase "important people".

One day, early in the spring, I was crossing Main Street with a friend who was doing his residency at the local hospital. As we stepped up onto the curb, the street sweeper working nearby doffed his cap and bowed with a gesture of complete supplication. My friend saluted the street sweeper with a friendly message for his wife and kids.

As soon as we were out of earshot, the young doctor told me: on the day Mark reported for duty at the hospital, the street sweeper, Pierre, stopped him at the entrance with a challenge: would you perform an operation free of charge on a very important person. Mark answered in the affirmative. Then Pierre told him how he had been prevented from working for the past four years because of a hernia. No doctor would repair the hernia because he had no money to pay for the operation. Mark said this little, dirty, unshaven, stooped old man looked up at him with a gleam in his eye and said: "I am a very important man. To my wife and twelve children I am the most important man in the world. There aren't many men who can say that to thirteen people he is the most important person in the world." Mark and Pierre saw the reality of the situation: each accepted his responsibility; each could give the other mutual respect.

TRENDS IN CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE

by

M.L. Peterson, University Dean of
Agriculture and Director, Agricultural Experiment
Station, University of California

Change is the essence of agriculture in California. And changes affecting people who work in California's temporary farm labor market have been numerous in these past few months.

We have seen more machines reach the stage of economic feasibility to replace farm labor. We have seen ideas for other equipment advanced by research to the point of engineering feasibility. We have seen what is probably the last extension of Public Law 78. And we are seeing California farmers undertaking a massive recruitment program for domestic workers to bring as many as 40,000 new families into our agricultural areas.

Some of these changes will help solve problems for some people. They will create problems for others.

From a farmer's point of view, the major problem is obtaining an adequate supply of qualified men willing to work at the right place and the right time. A farmer's seasonal needs for labor are very largely dictated by the inherent nature of farm crops and the vagaries of weather. He has little control once growth of a crop has started. Any interruption at any stage by nature or man--or by lack of men--may reduce the quality of his product or limit its final production, harvest, or sale on the market.

From a farm worker's standpoint, temporary employment on farms and ranches is full of problems. Earning a sufficient income for a family is one. Providing a permanent home, where children can attend school regularly and the family can become part of a social community, is surely another. Both problems relate primarily to annual incomes.

The consumer has one obvious main interest in agricultural labor, that of obtaining from agriculture an abundant, varied, and wholesome food supply at relatively low prices. The public is also concerned with the employment and business generated by agriculture in the non-agricultural sector of the economy.

Yet, the interests of farmers, workers, and the public are not always compatible. Mechanization is one factor which is changing the farm labor scene.

The biggest user of temporary farm labor is the tomato harvest.

During its peak the number of temporary workers employed runs from 40,000 to 45,000 of whom approximately 35,000 have been Mexican nationals. In 1962, when weather ripened the tomato crop rapidly, there were 46,000 Mexican nationals in the fields at the harvest peak. They have been available in large numbers, almost on overnight call, and they have conveniently returned to their homes in Mexico at the end of the harvest.

The on-farm value of California's tomato crop is about 130 million dollars. An economic value of this magnitude has naturally brought much interest in the development of a mechanical tomato harvester. Growers, processors, equipment manufacturers, and engineers and plant breeders in the University have coordinated their research efforts for several years. From the engineer's point of view, there is now a machine that will harvest tomatoes--about 100 acres in a season. Some 90 machines are now available. But the crop has not yet been tailored to fit the machine: today's varieties of tomatoes ripen over a fairly long period; the machine must remove the vine from the field; yields are much lower than by hand harvesting.

Our plant breeders have been developing a tomato variety that does ripen all of its fruit at nearly the same time. But it will be several years before this variety will be ready for general planting. For the next few years, then, unless we give up growing part of a 130 million dollar crop, tomato growers will need temporary harvest workers.

Strawberries call for the second largest number of temporary workers at peak season--16,000 to 18,000 pickers of whom roughly 10,000 have been Mexican nationals. Here the picture isn't as bright. There is no projected mechanized equipment to replace these temporary workers, not even in the distant future. The best estimate economists give is that unless temporary workers can be found somewhere, the California strawberry industry has no choice but to shrink acreage and production down to the labor available--possibly as much as 50 percent during the first year after discontinuing the Bracero program.

Lettuce is our third largest user of seasonal labor. It's just as perishable and dependent on having enough harvest workers at the right time. The future looks brighter, however, because our engineers have worked out the principles of mechanically harvesting lettuce two to three years from now. In the meantime, lettuce growers will also require a sizeable supply of temporary labor.

The asparagus harvest, at its peak, absorbs around 10,000 temporary workers, 5,000 of them Mexican nationals. We have a machine at Davis that will harvest asparagus. From an engineering point of view, it's ready. But until something changes the economic picture--such as a rise in the cost of labor--economics say "no". The machine can't select asparagus spears; it cuts them all, regardless of size. Many of the spears are small, so marketable yields may be 40 percent lower than with hand harvesting. Unless plant breeders can come up with an asparagus that grows in cycles, sending up many shoots at a time, or until the economic picture changes, asparagus growers will need their temporary labor supply to stay in business.

The citrus industry uses many temporary workers. Much research and development is being extended toward mechanizing citrus harvest, but nothing is known to eliminate the need for harvest workers. Citrus growers now bring in rather substantial numbers of domestic workers from other states--two or three busloads a week.

Green beans, melons, celery, cotton, and sugar beets all have used temporary labor in recent years. But mechanization is close: the cotton and sugar beet harvests now need little temporary help. Celery, from an engineering standpoint, can be harvested by machine. A mechanical harvester for green beans has been developed, but only for bush beans.

A mechanical harvester for cantaloupes, the biggest labor user of the melon crops is on the way. It is even selective. It lifts up the vine, drops off the ripe melons on a belt, and lays the vine down unharmed to finish ripening. But the machine is still only in the research stage, several years away from commercial use.

This is the mechanization scene for our biggest users of temporary farm labor. In recent years, California farmers have hired approximately 140,000 temporary workers during peak harvest periods, about half of whom have been foreign workers. It seems almost certain that for at least three to five years we will have to substitute other people for about 70,000 braceros.

Two other sources of harvest labor have received a good deal of attention. One is the so-called "green card" Mexicans. In many cases these are the same people who have been coming across the border as Braceros. But there is a difference. They come now as immigrants, with their families. When harvest work is over, they do not necessarily go home. They can become permanent California residents. After the harvest season, many of these workers have been able to find jobs in non-agricultural industries in competition with present domestic workers.

Another suggested source is the pool of labor from other states--the Southeast, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, for the most part--where there is substantial unemployment. It appears that considerable numbers of Puerto Ricans may also be brought into California. These are the pools of unemployment California farmers are considering in their massive recruitment program.

Importations of Mexican immigrants and of domestic labor from other states or Puerto Rico are essentially the same. All become potential residents of California. When the harvests are over, we can expect them to stay--with their families, with needs for housing, for school rooms and teachers, and for income in the months before the next harvest.

Effort is being made to develop local domestic labor pools. In the 1961 and 1962 experiments in Tulare County effective organization and planning was shown to lengthen the farm employment year. This effort was based on permanent farm crews trained to perform a variety of farm tasks. They could move from one farm to another on seasonal type of work to provide themselves fairly steady work and fairly regular paychecks.

In the Tulare County experiment two crews were organized: one by a farmer group, the Tulare County Farmers Association, and the other by the American Friends Service Committee, set up as a cooperative. The University's part, through the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, was to study the records kept on both crews.

While crew turnover interfered somewhat with the study, our agricultural economists estimate, on a basis of average daily earnings per worker, that a crew member working every day the crew worked could have earned $2,020 during the year. These crews worked on 10 different crops and seven different seasonal farm tasks. They worked at thinning, packing, checking, picking, pruning, grafting, loading, and hauling; on plums, peaches, nectarines, olives, grapes, figs, persimmons, Navel oranges, Valencia oranges, and lemons. All the work, except for lemons picked by the co-op crew in Ventura County, was done in Tulare County.

There were some problems. One was lack of communication between the crews who wanted work and farmers who needed workers. With better communication, our people estimate, members of the co-op crew, for example, could have worked 262 days instead of the 214 days they did work, and they could have increased their season's earnings to $2,442.

None of us would suggest, of course, that 262 days or $2,442 measure up to our standards of full employment. But this seasonal record is surely a measure of improvement and an indicator that in some parts of California, at least, work can be organized to make good use of locally resident workers.

This Tulare County experiment began as a study, but it has also borne results. The cooperative labor crew has been expanding, the workers themselves selecting high-quality workers to join them. As the number grows and as farmers gain more confidence in these workers, they may become an important source of farm labor in Tulare County. These workers, grouped cooperatively, were able to finance a bus for transportation to and from work, and to participate in state disability insurance and unemployment insurance programs. The farmers paid the cooperative for work done; the cooperative deducted revolving fund dues, social security, disability insurance, and unemployment insurance from each worker's paycheck.

The experiment was a success for growers who planned ahead and contracted for the worker crews. This type of organization can undoubtedly be used in other areas of California. But such crews are not self-generating. Growers, or some other organization, must take the responsibility of getting crews started. The Tulare County worker crews show that steps are possible to stabilize community living for farm workers.

If this looks like the hard way to go about providing seasonal workers, let's examine some alternatives.

California growers may bring 40,000 families into our agricultural communities from areas of unemployment in other states and Puerto Rico. This will tend to assure the farmer of a labor supply, but it may produce high social costs for local communities and the state. Temporary farm workers have been generally getting about 130 days of employment a year. If the number of temporary workers living in the state increases, there will be more workers seeking jobs during the off-peak periods, and the average number of days' work available will be still smaller. The fewer days a farm worker is employed, the greater the amount of welfare help his family is likely to need.

Our agricultural counties should give some thought to school needs. In a University study last spring, we estimated that if enough families were brought in to replace the Mexican nationals, California would need 140 additional new school rooms a year for the children.

If 40,000 new farm worker families should be the chosen solution, housing is surely another social cost to anticipate. It can be argued with some effect that housing for farm workers is a community responsibility. Year-round housing is hardly the logical burden of a farmer who needs harvest help only two or three weeks of the year.

While we have talked about the needs of farmers and workers, we have been entirely conscious that these are only central factors in the problems of families, the wives and the children of seasonal farm workers. If we are to avoid perpetuating poverty and substitute instead a war to end it, agriculture and agricultural communities must think and plan for these families.

I think we know that, for all people, pride and some fulfillment of it can be the first needs. Studies indicate that the first demands are a decent home and clothing so children will look like other children in the community. Only when these needs are met can our home advisors build interest in group organization, in sewing, education, and eventually in family nutrition. Food apparently does not come first. Probably the key guidance needed by most farm worker families is money management, buying and budgeting as well as stretching yearly earnings. But it is the pride in normal home living--stability--that comes first.

I think most of the trends in California agriculture indicate that the direction must be toward a resident labor supply. In a farm worker family with a permanent home, children can have the stability to move toward improved skills, better education, and higher earning power. A look at the history and future of farm mechanization points to fewer seasonal jobs on the farm but also to more skilled and better paid ones. Some of the jobs will be in plants manufacturing the tomato, lettuce and asparagus harvesting machines; and they will surely be better jobs than the back-bending ones of today's hand harvesting.

The trends are encouraging. We can picture an ultimately mechanized farm production, a corps of stable farm machine operators, and comfortably housed, permanent farm worker families. We may even look to a time when the term "families who follow the crops" is outmoded. I can't suggest that such a future is close.

A farmer doesn't have the same measures of control over his product that the manufacturer of cars or lawnmowers does. He can't close the plant until the inventory goes down. A farmer will never have complete control of much of his output, of how much labor he will need to harvest it, or when he will need the labor.

Yet California agriculture is in serious competition with that in other states and other countries. In growing tomatoes, for example, we have only a little advantage over some other states, and production is increasing in Italy and Mexico. As we move toward freer trade, we can expect more imports of both fresh and processed products. To meet competition, the California farmer has climate, production ability and considerable progress toward mechanization. But he has an immediate problem of staying in business. That can only mean some source of temporary harvest labor.

I think caution must be shown in mass importation of farm worker families. In agricultural communities the costs of schools and welfare aid can come only from taxes paid by all the people of the community. These may be unavoidable costs. Some statewide and even nationwide planning is needed now. And before planning is possible, some questions must be answered.

We have data and experience to indicate the need for labor at different times and in different crops, but this does need further refinement--particularly in view of the recruiting campaign being contemplated.

The measure of efficiency must also be applied to the available domestic labor force. If we are asking how many of our unemployed are available to do agricultural work--we must also ask how many are able to do it. Where are they and what wages will be needed to attract them into farm work?

Everyone seems agreed that some of our labor will have to come from other states. Again, the questions arise: what rate of pay will they expect? what kind of housing will persuade them to move themselves and their families? what will they do when seasonal work is ended? will they go back to their native states? if they stay here, how will this affect state and county budgets for welfare? recreation? education?

It is time that we find answers to some of these questions before thousands of new farm workers arrive in our agricultural communities.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND FARM LABOR

by

Jack Howard, Assistant to the Secretary of Labor
United States Department of the Army
Washington, D. C.

The discussions that will be held during this meeting will be particularly significant, for the farm labor market is in a period of fundamental and dramatic change. The decisions which must be made within the next few months concerning our use of domestic farm workers may well determine the direction of agriculture in this country for many years to come. We have reached the point where we can no longer afford to procrastinate in the solution of our farm labor problems.

Few problems in our society have persisted so stubbornly as those of the people who live on and from the land: working farmers, farm workers, and migrants. The brutalizing effects of endemic unemployment and poverty; the shocking facts of malnutrition, poor health, and disease; the debilitating waste of young lives in child labor, in meager education, and in wretched housing--these things are well enough known to lie heavily on the conscience of large sections of the American public.

But one of the curious characteristics of this problem is that too often these facts of deprivation are rediscovered every few years, widely publicized, loudly lamented, and then pushed aside--not forgotten, just pushed aside. Significant of these Conferences is that California is not permitted to forget.

The plight of farm labor right now is not only the result of procrastination; it is also caused by the fact that several important developments are colliding at this point in time. The greatest of these developments is mechanization, the cumulative effects of which have only begun to be felt in recent years. While the nation is finally becoming concerned over the effects of automation in offices and industry, there is as yet little realization that the pace of mechanization on the farm has been even more rapid, and its effects even more deeply felt.

Even as we meet, researchers in Florida are perfecting mechanical tree shakers to harvest citrus fruit. Scientists in New Jersey have developed a self-propelled device, equipped with an electric eye, to select and cut asparagus. Geneticists in Michigan have succeeded in breeding a dwarf cucumber vine which is suitable for machine harvesting in a once-over operation. And agricultural engineers in the Western States are refining experimental harvesters for lettuce, cantaloupes, grapes, figs, and tough skinned tomatoes.

The continuing improvement in cotton-harvesting machines is taking the heaviest toll in farm employment. Last year, the cotton crop was 5 percent larger than in 1962, yet the total seasonal labor used in all cotton activities showed a 12 percent decrease.

A California Senate Fact-Finding Committee found that between 1950 and 1959 there was an estimated 25 percent decrease in both cultural and harvesting functions in field crops because of mechanization. And the pace of mechanization has stepped up considerably since that time.

There are some figures to indicate what the future effects of mechanization will be. Between now and 1968, it is estimated there will be a 14 percent increased output in Apricots, but a 15 percent decline in manpower needs; in Peaches, a predicted gain of 16 percent in output with no change in manpower needs; in Prunes, a 21 percent increase in output with a 6 percent decline in manpower needs; in Tomatoes, a 21 percent decline in manpower needs.

However well mechanization may solve immediate labor supply problems, it often creates new problems. For example, the development and widespread use of the cotton harvester in the Central Valleys of California violently interrupted what had been for years the work patterns of many of the most reliable migratory farm workers. With the good earnings of steady employment from early fall into winter denied to them, many of these workers declined to enter the California migratory stream. Thus, the mechanization of one crop served to hinder growers in dealing with their state-wide seasonal labor problems.

Those most seriously affected by this rapid rate of mechanization are the migratory workers, who are faced with increasingly poorer job opportunities in the fields and crops in which they have been traditionally employed in the greatest numbers. Just how seriously they are being affected is shown by the fact that the peak employment of migratory workers last year was 14 percent less than in 1962, and their annual average employment dropped 11 percent. And, remember, this was in one year.

This situation of less and less demand for hand farm labor is coupled with the mass exodus from farm to city. In 1962, a total of 646,000 persons left the farms of the nation, 4.5 percent of the farm population. In 1910, one out of every three Americans lived on farms; by 1960, only one out of every nine were on farms. During the 1950's, while the population of the nation increased by 28 million, farm population declined by 4 million.

This long term trend away from the farms is but one problem. There is the inherent problem of the farm labor market which must seasonally expand very suddenly, and for a brief period only, by half a million workers to meet harvest demands; and then, almost as suddenly, contract and squeeze out those half million workers.

Another factor which has worked to diminish employment for migrant workers, as well as for local domestic labor, has been the use of foreign contract workers under Public Law 78 and other foreign labor programs.

We must recognize that temporary foreign workers, by their nature, are a captive labor force which is inimical to our free labor market traditions. We must also recognize, that the use of any large numbers of temporary foreign workers has a builtin adverse effect on our own domestic workers.

Approximately 209,200 foreign contract workers were admitted to this country in 1963, of whom almost 187,000 came from Mexico under Public Law 78. California has been the largest user of Mexican workers under Public Law 78. In 1962, 195,000 Mexican workers contracted for work in the United States; California contracted 116,500. In 1963, there were contracts for 187,000 Braceros: California used 111,000, Texas 26,000.

It is reasonable to assume that if this source of farm labor had not been available, ways would have been found to meet the demands for farm labor, and that the beneficiaries would have been our own domestic farm workers. Herein lies a ray of hope for our migrant workers.

This is the last year for the Mexican farm labor program. We must assume this, for the Congress has clearly expressed its intent in this matter. We must assume that the Mexican program will terminate on December 31, 1964.

Second, we must assume that in view of this rather clear-cut direction from Congress, and the reasons which appear to have motivated its action, other foreign labor programs will not take the place of Public Law 78, and that our national policy will be moving in the direction of diminishing use of all foreign labor programs.

Therefore, we are faced with an entirely new situation in the farm labor market which will demand a reorientation of our thinking. When we accept the fact that no foreign workers will be available in 1965, then we are prepared to take adequate steps to meet the demand for the additional domestic workers needed to replace them.

Termination of foreign worker importation will create a competitive situation in the farm labor market. Employers are going to have to greatly expand their recruitment efforts to attract domestic workers, and consequently, to make farm wages, housing, and working conditions more attractive.

Traditionally, farm wages climb slowly. Preliminary results of a study comparing agricultural and manufacturing wage rates paid ten years ago with those paid today indicate that while manufacturing wages have been increased about 50 percent, farm wage rates have risen only about 30 percent. More significantly, the 50 percent rise in manufacturing wage rates meant just over a 75 cents an hour increase, while the 30 percent increase in farm wages amounted to less than 25 cents an hour in 10 years. There must be an improvement in farm wages, not because the Government says so, but because farm employers are going to have to be competitive.

Secondly, it is highly doubtful if sufficient domestic labor can be attracted to the field unless employers are willing to provide decent family housing on a greatly expanded scale. Admittedly, this will be much more expensive than the single person housing employers have developed under the foreign worker programs.

There are several ways the Government can assist the employers. One is to rearrange and strengthen migratory routes to make the fullest use of this source of domestic farm labor. It is entirely probable that new migratory routes may have to be established to funnel migrant workers into those areas which have in the past depended so largely on foreign workers. The Farm Labor Service of the Labor Department will be of great assistance in this task through expansion of its Annual Worker Plan.

Equally important, we must take steps to assure our domestic farm workers--and particularly migrant workers--of their fair share of our national prosperity. It is not too much to ask that they be granted some of the same prerequisites we have been willing to grant workers from other countries.

To accomplish this, several pieces of legislation are pending before the Congress. An impressive breakthrough was achieved in 1962 with the passage of the Migrant Health Act, the first success such legislation has gained in 30 years. The action was the result of increased public awareness of the problems of the migrant workers, and an increased willingness on the part of Congress to do something about them. We can be optimistic that additional legislation to improve the lot of the migrant will be forthcoming. Senator Harrison Williams of New Jersey has introduced a package of nine bills, of which the Health bill was one, which taken together present a balanced program to alleviate the worst problems of migrant workers. As Labor Secretary Wirtz testified before a Congressional committee, the Department of Labor supports the objectives of all of the Williams' Bills.

Of particular interest are certain ones, all of which the Senate has passed and which we hope the House will also approve. They include S.521, the Education Bill, designed to provide States financial assistance to improve the educational opportunities of migrant workers and their children; S.522, the Day-Care Bill, which would authorize matching grants to States to establish day-care services for children of migratory workers; S.523, the Child Labor Bill, to regulate the employment of all children in agriculture; and S.524, the Crew Leader Registration Bill, requiring the regulation and licensing of crew leaders, and protecting migrant workers from some of the abuses that have occurred.

We are also vigorously supporting S.527, the volunteer farm placement program, to supplement the present Federal-State farm placement procedures. This bill is designed to meet the problems of providing fuller employment for farm workers, at the same time assuring growers that a sufficient number of qualified workers will be available when needed.

We also believe there is a great need for the legislation embodied in S.981 concerning rural housing.

The Farm Labor Service of the Department of Labor plans to expand and improve its day-haul programs in an effort to recruit more local domestic labor for those areas removed from migratory routes. This is but one of the steps that can be taken to improve domestic recruitment.

We can and must make fuller use of the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act.

One of the effects of farm mechanization has been the elimination of unskilled jobs--the so-called stoop-labor jobs--and an accompanying shortage of farm workers skilled in operating increasing complex farm machinery. To alleviate this shortage, and at the same time to provide more workers with employment, we must make fuller use of these available training programs.

As of December 31, 1963, 79 training projects in agricultural occupations had been approved under the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act. These projects involved almost 2,500 trainees in 26 states. A total of 77 projects have already been completed involving the training of some 1,600 workers. Sixteen training projects for 723 trainees have been approved for California, involving training in such occupations as vineyard and tree pruner, nurseryman, tractor operator, farm mechanic, and groundsman-gardener.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the agriculture industry will soon be faced with serious recruitment problems. In California, which has depended so heavily on Braceros, the problem will be intensified. It will take the best efforts of growers, labor supply sources, voluntary agencies, and government agencies at all levels to meet the demands for adequate domestic farm labor. Improved wages and working conditions, expanded day-haul programs, expanded use of migratory workers, greater use of part-time labor.

It is clear that the solution of our farm labor problems will not come easily, nor will they come overnight. Habit and tradition are difficult adversaries. The present situation in the farm labor market demands new approaches, new ideas, new solutions, and new effort. It also demands increased cooperation among farm employers, labor suppliers, and government agencies.

We are, after all, working for the same goals--continued and growing prosperity for the nation, for agriculture, for its purpose will provide the incentive and the means to do what must be done.

THE STATE AND THE FARM WORKER

by

Frank A. Mesple'
Cabinet Secretary to
Governor Brown

It is my pleasure to bring you the following message from Governor Edmund G. Brown:

> "As many of you know, I recently returned from an official visit to Mexico where I conferred with President Lopez Mateos and the Mexican Minister of Exterior Relations on a number of matters affecting California.
>
> "Among them was the question of the importation of Mexican farm labor to California. The President assured me that, while Mexico believes the Bracero program is of benefit to both our countries, his government has never believed the program agreement to be obligatory and is willing to agree with the decision of the American government regarding its future.
>
> "This development reinforces the growing agreement on this side of the border that the Bracero program must be terminated at the end of its current term. The result is that everyone involved in California agriculture--the growers, the state, representatives of labor and civic organizations interested in the plight and potential of California farm labor--now face a new challenge.
>
> "It is this: to gear up now to meet California agriculture's demand for seasonal workers from the domestic labor supply and to meet that demand in a way which accords with our state's and our people's traditionally high standards of economic and social justice and human dignity.
>
> "I realize that the people at this Conference are here specifically to face that challenge. I want you to know that I value highly the contributions you have made in the past to the solution of the problems of families who follow the crops and that I welcome the recommendations you will evolve here to meet the challenge and harness our enormous agricultural power for the good of all Californians.
>
> "Congratulations to you and best wishes for a productive session."

The Governor's Cabinet concerns itself with the whole spectrum of state policies and problems. Agriculture--and its difficulties--have been on the agenda at virtually all our meetings. As Governor Brown has indicated in his letter, there is a critical character to this meeting today.

One of the primary facts of life that I hope this meeting will accept is that the Bracero program is dead. The end is scheduled for December 31st of 1964. If anyone has any doubts, I would ask you to read the Congressional Record of the debates. Even the firm supporters of the Bracero program who represent the Central Valley congressional districts clearly indicated that this was the last time they would ask for an extension. No matter what anyone in California might feel about the matter, Congress will not reconsider this final extension again.

The agricultural organizations of California are to be congratulated on their acceptance of this decision and their willingness to look for alternative solutions. While the termination of the Bracero program will raise unique problems for some of our agricultural industries, I am confident that by working together we can meet the challenge. While this conference is not designed to produce specific recommendations, I would hope that any light you might be able to shed on the problem can be used in our search for solutions.

On March 13, Governor Brown will be co-sponsoring, together with the U.S. Department of Labor, a special hearing on the whole farm labor area. Perhaps some answer can be found to the frustrating dilemma of a six percent unemployment rate in California at the time that we face a labor shortage on our farms.

Some say that such a complex problem requires complex solutions. Perhaps they are right, but I think the necessary start is an attitude by all affected parties to work together toward a solution. The greatest chore--and a continuing one--is to dispel the emotional, irrational "images" we create in our own minds.

> "The farmer as a grasping monster, insensitive to human needs."
>
> "The farm worker as a wino from skid row, without ambition or morality."

You people are sitting here together in a constructive and responsible way. Mrs. Wyckoff and all who have helped in this meeting should be proud of this unique gathering. You can perform a tremendous service in keeping the lines of communication open.

This task in itself is no easy one. I am always reminded of the unfortunate experience of the Agricultural Labor Commission created in 1961. With two representatives from agriculture and two from labor, the answer was pretty much predetermined. The conclusion was two reports, each in disagreement with the other.

We are sobered in California by our bigness, our growth, and our physical and intellectual mobility. This is taking place at the same time that we are experiencing a technological revolution. Dean Peterson has very vividly discussed the challenges of automation in agriculture. Fewer and fewer farmers will produce more and more agricultural produce. Our educational institutions will be faced with the task of retraining to meet the changing skills.

Together, with the technological revolution, we must consider the implications of the social revolution of our times; the revolution of rising expectations. The parents of today want a better and fuller life for themselves and especially for their children. Many who labor in the fields insist their children will never do so if they can avoid it.

For some - it is a practical reason - the low earning capacity leaves restricted economic horizons.

For others - there is a sociological reason - agricultural labor carries a stigma. The old Jeffersonian ideal of the dignity of agricultural work no longer is a convincing one.

Your meeting today is looking at the problem in the context of the family as a cohesive and stabilizing social institution.

There is no greater need for successful family life than an adequate home. I hope you will turn your attention to the need for adequate housing for the farm worker and, I might add, for many farm families as well.

Just yesterday, on February 26, Governor Brown submitted a statement before Congress on housing legislation. He speaks particularly of how inadequate housing affects the farm worker and his family:

> " . . . I want to call your attention to what probably is the most urgent problem of all--housing for the agricultural worker and farm families.
>
> "For the farm worker truly is America's forgotten man. No one lives under more pitiful, degrading conditions. A survey of six agricultural communities by our State Division of Housing shows that: more than 80 percent of farm worker families live in dwellings which violate standards of health, safety and comfort; nearly 65 percent of the dwellings occupied by general field workers are dilapidated or deteriorated; pit privies still serve 33 percent of the dwellings occupied by general field workers; thirty percent of the dwellings have no bathing facilities and 25 percent lack even a kitchen sink with running water.
>
> "And because he is so poorly paid he cannot afford to build or rent better homes. Nor can he improve the slum dwelling he already is living in. Do I need to point out that these rural slums are trap ghettoes which breed crime, juvenile delinquency, disease and illiteracy?

"Somewhere we must begin to break the vicious circle which the rural and urban slum dweller finds himself in. A decent home will give him and his family hope and a new sense of decency. It will infuse him with aspiration, without which only despair remains.

"There is a special urgency for farm housing this year. The expiration of Public Law 78--the Mexican Bracero program--in December of this year means that in 1965 California and other states will have to rely completely on domestic farm labor. Today we do not have enough housing available for workers with families. Nor will growers invest the enormous sums needed to build such housing . . .

"I believe there is a need for at least two kinds of housing.

"First, permanent, off-the-farm homes for the farm worker family who wants and needs a year-round home. This is the most desirable situation for the farm worker and it is the public policy we must strive for.

"Second, temporary housing for those "migrants" who are needed for certain farm operations in certain areas for short periods of time. This could be built and operated by local housing authorities or the State. In any case, however, whoever builds it will need Federal assistance.

"There may be other alternatives as well, although I do not favor any which would create "company towns", with the worker completely at the mercy of the grower for housing. American experience with that system shows a long, bitter struggle by the worker to free himself. The farm worker has little enough freedom of movement. He needs more, not less."

Governor Brown will be submitting his own proposal for state legislation on housing on Monday, March 2. It will set up an "Office of Housing and Community Development" to provide a badly needed focus for California's housing problems. The Governor will also propose a commission to follow-up and extend the fine work done by the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing Problems headed by Edward Eichler.

I hope the banks, savings and loan groups, and the realtors don't fight a "bogey" man but help in these constructive efforts.

Let me assure you that this legislation will be an important factor in helping meet the housing problems facing agricultural labor.

We also have to meet the problems of hours, wages, and working conditions head on. I contend that it is not a matter of minimum wages, but of adequate wages, AND the ability of our agricultural industries to survive and grow with these additional labor costs.

We cannot look to agricultural labor as a special class of workers isolated from all others. Nor can we continue to deny them the minimal protections afforded the industrial workers.

The "incentive gap" between the agricultural and industrial laborer must be substantially closed. Labor should be attracted to the agricultural industries and not be considered as a place of last resort.

Nor can we continue to blame the California welfare programs for the inability of agriculture to attract adequate labor. If the argument had merit, AND IT DOES NOT, then agriculture and not our fine welfare program should bear the blame. Some are seriously contending that agricultural labor has little more to offer than our welfare program. I am sure responsible agricultural leaders do not share this view.

We need some bold inquiry into such matters as:

- --unemployment insurance for agricultural workers;
- --the fringe benefits, the protections and security needed to stabilize agricultural labor;
- --efforts to improve health and sanitation for farm workers;
- --efforts to bring the needed education and skills to the farm family--young and adult alike.

Maybe we need a California version of the Peace Corps. It's a shame the federal legislation is stymied in Congress and the enthusiasm of our foreign efforts cannot be applied here at home.

We have hope that the various projects currently underway in our Compensatory Education Program will provide some answers on how to bring our full educational resources to the children of our agricultural workers. If the results measure up to our expectations, I am sure Governor Brown will call for an extension and expansion of the program next year.

I know agriculture will face up squarely to the need for increased incentives to attract and hold capable workers. Government--federal, state, and local--can and will assist, but the basic solutions must be found by agriculture's effective competition with other types of employment.

A prosperous and growing agricultural industry will be able to provide the necessary conditions and benefits for its workers. Their cause is a common one.

Our agriculture is one of the most productive in the world. Its efficiency, thanks to men like Dean Peterson, is constantly increasing.

One California farmer provides the food and fiber needs for 25 Americans and for 4 others abroad.

Our output has increased 140 percent since the end of World War II--

three times the rate of non-agricultural productivity.

The consumer spends a smaller percentage of his budget on food needs than ever before in history, and while the figures on gross production, cash value, and net income per farm impresses us, there are some other sobering facts.

First of all, every farmer who works out in the field personally bears some of the burden of depressed agricultural labor conditions.

Let me quote from President Johnson's Message on Agriculture of January 31, 1964:

> "Gross farm income in 1963 was 3.2 billion dollars higher than in 1960, a gain of 8 percent.
>
> "Net income per farm rose during this same period from $2,961 to $3,425, a gain of 16 percent.
>
> "Government stocks of feed grains have declined by 22,000,000 tons from their 1961 high of 85,000,000 tons, enabling us to save $230,000,000 a year on storage and other carrying charges.
>
> "Our agricultural exports in 1963 were 5.6 billion dollars, the highest in history. They represented one quarter of our total exports of goods and services.
>
> "Farm-dependent towns and industries have reflected this economic improvement. Bank deposits in agricultural counties have increased 20 percent; and farmers have been able to purchase an estimated $800,000,000 more in farm equipment in the past three years than they would have been able to buy with a 1960 level of income.
>
> "But statistical totals can be deceiving.
>
> "The income of the average farm family is still only 55 percent of that received by the average non-farm family.
>
> "Steadily rising costs are still eating up the major portion of the increase in gross farm income, forcing upon the farmer a cruel cost-price squeeze.
>
> "Almost one-half of our nation's poor live in rural areas.
>
> "Farming communities have three times the proportion of dilapidated and substandard homes as the rest of the nation.
>
> "Three-quarters of those employed as farm laborers earned less than $2,000 a year in cash wages from all sources."

The President effectively indicates some of the national tasks to be met:

1. Maintain and improve farm income, and strengthen the family farm in particular.
2. Use our food abundance to raise standards of living, both at home and around the world.
3. Conserve both our material and human resources in rural America--where one third of our citizens live.

The Food-for-Peace Program should be continued and enlarged. Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, who once headed this project, visited Sacramento just two weeks ago and expressed his pleasure at President Johnson's call for a five-year extension.

Surplus food distribution at home is equally justified. The Food Stamp Program must be resurrected and extended.

These observations are not extraneous to your subject. They relate directly to agriculture and the families who must work to sustain it.

Our problems are those of abundance--not scarcity.

We need to reconcile the needs of our farmers and the aspirations of the farm laborer. Such a reconciliation will make the rural environment an opportunity for the good life and not a hindrance.

My best wishes for a successful conference.

As President Johnson is apt to quote from Isaiah:

> "Come let us reason together."

OUR COMMON CHALLENGE

Excerpts from remarks by Albin J. Gruhn,
President California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO

Recent developments with regard to the fate of Public Law 78 have placed upon all of us a unique responsibility and an opportunity. It is therefore most urgent that we clearly define the problem while seeking to develop the fullest possible degree of cooperation.

Because it is fundamentally important at this crucial juncture that there be an absolute minimum of misinformation, illusions, and exaggeration of the short-range adjustments that will occur as a result of the Bracero program's ending, I am going to venture into a few areas of reality.

The challenge confronting us today is to look stark reality in the eye in order to find approaches to guarantee the development and stabilization of an adequate domestic farm labor force. We firmly believe that domestic farm workers can do the job more effectively than the Braceros. In support of this conviction, I cite the testimony of the Coachella Farmers' Association at the Senate Fact-Finding Committee hearings on farm labor housing:

> ". . . we assume that the domestic worker is more intelligent, speaks English and can do better work than a boy out of the hills of Mexico. That is a natural assumption. I think it is sound."

To the California farm worker, the reality we speak of usually means considerably less than year-round employment, and wage rates ranging generally from .90¢ to $1.25 an hour--roughly one-third those earned by floor sweepers in nearby manufacturing plants. Reality also means that the cost of food, housing, clothing, utilities and medical care for the farm worker is nevertheless on a par with that paid by the floor sweeper.

Recent developments may reflect a change in the grower community's concept of reality. Two reasons were given by the Council of California Growers not to renew the Bracero program: (1) recognition of the will of the people; and (2) concern over the increasingly serious problems of unemployment and a desire to contribute to President Johnson's war on urban and rural poverty.

Yet we have also heard much talk about the inevitability of an influx of 50,000 or more families from other states and, further, that these families will remain in California permanently.

During the peak of the 1963 season, there were 309,000 hired farm workers on California farms: 244,000 were Californians, both local residents and those who harvested away from their home towns. Slightly over 20 percent of last year's peak labor force, 64,700, were filled by other sources: 49,200 Braceros, and 15,500 interstate migrants.

It is pertinent to inquire why only 15,500 workers came from other states, and that 49,200 additional Bracero jobs were not claimed by interstate migrants if, in fact, there was compliance with the law's supposed guarantee that domestic workers be given prior rights to any such work.

First, they didn't come in greater numbers because the wage rates were not sufficiently attractive. California farm wages were inferior to the hourly rates in effect in Washington and in three eastern states, the same as those in Utah, and only one to three cents above those in Oregon, Nevada, and Idaho. Secondly, bitter experience had left them quite realistic about the difficulty of obtaining steady work in competition with the Bracero even during the harvest season.

Yet, it is somewhat astonishing to realize that over 244,000 Californians did in fact work at seasonal or year-round jobs in this industry last year at peak season, in competition with the Bracero and at $1.00 to $1.10 hourly wages for field work. That Californians were, in fact, already the solid backbone of the state's agricultural labor force in 1963 strongly suggests that tens of thousands of others in the State will be attracted to such work as the conditions of employment undergo some of the long deferred improvements.

If almost a quarter million Californians worked in the State's agriculture at the present level of wage rates, who can deny that many more thousands would be attracted if wages rose to the $1.25 to $1.50 per hour range? And who would venture to predict what would happen if wages began to seriously approach those prevailing in the rest of the economy?

There seems to be another major fallacy underlying many of the current predictions: the argument that the growers cannot pay significantly higher wages than are now in effect. This assumes that no matter how much change there is in wage rates, there will be no change in either the acreage that is planted to a given crop or in the market price that the grower will receive. Closely related is the assumption that all growers will be affected in precisely the same manner.

The Census states there were more than 99,000 farms in California in 1959. More than three-fifths of their hired labor costs were below $1,000 or not at all. Therefore, only 1.6 percent of the 99,000 farms accounted for almost 39 percent of total $500 million spent on hired farm labor.

Also consider that while the independent farmer wants to maximize the price for his product, the corporate farmer often is primarily interested in keeping the price of the commodity as low as possible to maximize sales volume and profits from canning, freezing and other integrated operations.

The simple mechanics of the marketplace can dictate that lower wages available to integrated agribusiness are converted almost overnight to still greater expansion of production, depressed farm commodity prices, hardship for the independent grower and a bonanza for the integrated agribusiness interests.

Increased wages will place pressures upon these large grower-processor interests in order to bring production more into line with effective demand, thereby yielding a significantly higher price to all growers for their product. Seen in this light, the end of the Bracero program stands an excellent chance of becoming a major boon to the bulk of California's farmers.

Organized labor can and must play the major role in bringing order out of the present confusion. If the farm labor force is to be rationalized, it will inevitably be done through unions of the workers' own choosing just as has already happened in many seasonal lines of employment (i.e. the construction industry). The goal is to bring the man and the job together expeditiously.

It is hardly a coincidence that virtually every other industry, before it was organized, strenuously protested that it could not live with the union. Despite periodic differences of opinion, it is a rare industry which any longer retains that view. As a matter of fact, agriculture and its related industries in many areas are living today quite harmoniously within the framework of collective bargaining. Consider the dairy industry, the canneries, packing sheds, frozen food plants and the like.

Ultimately the only conceivable key to a stable labor force lies in recognizing that the people involved are normal human beings, aspiring for individual dignity in daily life. In the labor-management relationship, it is obvious this can't be realized unless the worker has a meaningful voice in determining the mutual understandings and conditions of that relationship.

Obviously in an industry where employers draw at random from a common labor pool year in and year out, and where it little matters to either party whether he returns next year to precisely the same employer, there is little opportunity to know each other very well as human beings. And it is impossible for a worker to live in our society, to attend our schools and to otherwise be educated in the principles of democracy as man's brightest hope, without resenting the one-way relationship that has existed in agricultural employment. Nor is it possible for him to ignore the implications of second-class citizenship involved in his exclusion from so much of the social legislation, such as unemployment insurance.

The answers to problems posed by the termination of the Bracero program are hardly overwhelming: they involve more and better family housing and access to community facilities, including day care centers; improving access to medical care and hospitalization; and increasing educational opportunity for children and adults.

These involve governmental decisions at the local, state and federal levels, and our fullest support and cooperation can be counted upon.

No matter how you view the problem, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the entire complex of problems has one primary causal factor: the abysmally low annual family incomes in this industry stemming from low wages and the unnecessarily abbreviated length of the work year. Underlying is the lack of opportunity for farm workers to speak collectively in the community, in the State legislature, in Congress and at the bargaining table. It is to these extremely lively and urgent issues that we hope you will be addressing yourselves rather than the mirage of 50,000 families marching into California next New Year's Day.

OUR COMMON CHALLENGE

Excerpts from remarks by Allan Grant,
President California Farm Bureau Federation

It is generally recognized that this is probably the last year for the importation of Braceros under Public Law 78.

The Bracero Program has been helpful to California agriculture and to the Bracero himself. The Mexican national has benefitted financially with wages much higher than he could command at home. The program has helped the Bracero to improve his status at home and his earning power at home by teaching him new techniques of agricultural procedures.

Abuses of Public Law 78 which may have existed years ago, when the program started, have long since been corrected. The Mexican nationals are given full protection under the present program.

A one-year extension of Public Law 78 does not permit long-term planning on the part of the grower since leases are often signed from two to five year periods, in such crops as tomatoes and beets. In addition, these two crops are often grown in a four-year rotation program with barley, milo, and alfalfa; the tomato harvest particularly requires the use of Braceros and is the crop which gives the grower an opportunity for profit on the whole rotation program.

More than twenty grower-operated recruiting and referral offices have failed to produce enough domestic workers to fill the need at peak harvest time--in spite of the fact that California growers pay the highest farm wages and provide the best working conditions and continuity of employment in our country.

If we could provide housing, we might be able to attract more family type workers to California agriculture. Local communities then would be asked to cooperate in such housing projects, as well as provide additional classrooms, hospitals, and other public facilities which would be needed by these families. It has been estimated that importation of 40,000 families into California for temporary farm work would increase school enrollment by some 65,000 pupils--at a cost of $23,000,000 for instruction and $40,000,000 for classrooms.

If California needs 120,000 supplemental workers in its agriculture and does not have the avenue to be supplied these worker forces, what are the probable avenues of adjustment? The California State Department of Employment--Farm Placement Division--indicates some 15,000 youths worked in agriculture during the year 1963, mostly during the school recess. This is 7,000 more than in 1962. Yet we still needed and received about 120,000 Braceros. Let us suppose in 1965 we do not have Public Law 78 to rely upon and that we can, through prodigious efforts of the farm placement and combined agricultural organizations, bring summer participation of youths up to 45,000 (some say this is dreaming). Because crops do not schedule themselves to comply with the school year, this figure must be netted out at 35,000. This still leaves a deficiency of 85,000 workers. Let us suppose that application of various work-saving aids and some mechanization would allow a further reduction of 25,000 workers presently necessary. This still leaves California agriculture 60,000 workers short of requirements.

REALITY, RESPONSIBILITY, RESPECT

Excerpts from the remarks of Winslow Christian,
Administrator, Health and Welfare Agency,
State of California

There is no new insight--no legislative or political bomb to drop--but I would like to report what may be in the future regarding the three R's.

We must think systematically, on the needs, hopes and expectations of under-privileged rural families . . . There is a direct relationship between our "growing up" agricultural industry and the end of the Bracero program, and the migration families who follow the crops.

In California, the government must bear its share of responsibility for all its residents. The migrants therefore are a concern of the State. There are some changes in effect or in prospect which reflect the State government's responsibility toward the migrant farm family. They include:

1) conscious planning to advance the stability of the work force in a period when mechanized production is increasing;

2) a recognition of the increasing pressure automation presents to agriculture, thereby requiring that capital be stabilized and the service of laborers be upgraded perhaps by retraining;

3) altering the attitude of Congress toward the Bracero program.

Responsibility, on the part of the State, takes many forms. First, Aid to Families with Dependent Children will now serve farm worker families who must follow the crops. The seasonal aspect of these families puts them periodically in need of such aid even though other measures of income maintenance would be better for them and for the tax-paying public.

We can also take some guidance for social planning to assist the migrant farm family from the impetus of President Johnson's attack on poverty: here attention is focussed on providing adequate housing for migrants, stimulating manpower training programs, community development. Behind both the Federal and State plans is the knowledge that people want to help in their own reorganization. Programs must work to help people organize themselves, and moreover, to strengthen family ties . . . Instead of these people being treated like atoms, pushed about by every and all pressure placed upon them, they will become a meaningful part of the community environment (under community development).

There has been mentioned that the South San Joaquin Valley is one area planned for federally supported programs.

Creation of the State Office of Housing will direct attention to specific improved housing for migrant worker families.

The Health and Welfare Agency now offers services to bring together interests of education and welfare to develop day care centers and other pertinent services.

Respect is always a two-way arrangement. For example, the State should not be asked to perpetuate a labor force which is discriminated against in industry by having to endure substandard conditions. Moreover, the State should not be asked to make what amounts to public subsidies to industries which do not compete in the labor market. Legislation is needed to phase-out discriminations against agriculture later. The minimum wage is just one area where reform is needed; unemployment insurance is another. Finally, we should not seek to use government to achieve reforms when there are other sources, such as industry, to take leadership in planning and implementing such reforms. The agriculture industry in California, now that the Bracero program is ending, should not delay in "industrial growing up," assuming the responsibility for maintaining a sound working force which is respected and valued for its intrinsic importance to the industry.

If nothing further, this Conference may have stimulated ideas on methods to assist California agriculture to move forward in industrial growth.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

Excerpts from the Closing Remarks of
Mrs. Hubert Wyckoff, Chairman
Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth

This may very well be our last Conference. You wonder why? Because the continuance really depends on whether this type of meeting can serve any useful purpose. The evaluation sheets you complete will give us some indication of what you think about this Conference and the value of successive ones.

Now, each of you will go home. You will return to your usual groupings: the farmers will meet with the farmers; the farm workers will meet with the farm workers; the teachers and parents will meet. You take the recommendations from the study groups--and you act upon them in your own groups. The California Farm Bureau Federation may decide for or against any of them. So may the AFL-CIO. We hope the judgment of each of these groups may be improved by having spent this time here together with people you don't ordinarily meet and talk to.

This Conference will never attempt to speak for the California Farm Bureau Federation or the AFL-CIO. These organizations have their own policies set in convention--and they speak for themselves. This Conference speaks for no one. It is a clearing house--a place where you may come and test your ideas against those of others, seeking useful responses and reactions which may enlarge your frame of reference.

Bear in mind that the findings and recommendations developed by the study groups represent only what these individuals have forged in two days of discussion. All the Conference staff does is receive them, record them, and send them to you for your study--and action if you see fit to act. We have never asked this plenary session to endorse any recommendations.

Now we face the challenge ahead. We have heard repeatedly during this session: "help the farmers to help themselves." I wonder if we could leave the Conference with a broadened concept of the theme, reality, responsibility and respect, so that when we go home we do try to help one another. We all need help. Perhaps most of all we need help in understanding human motivation.

> I am reminded of a ex-farm worker from North Carolina who took care of my home in Washington, D.C., during the war. After a year, she asked for a vacation. I agreed, and asked what she was planning to do. "I'm going back to Maxon, North Carolina, to pick cotton," she said. "Why," I asked. "Well," she said, "I like to pick cotton--and my friends are all there, and besides Mr. Collins needs me." Mr. Collins was her former employer, and later I discovered while he did not pay munificent wages, she had

a good relationship with him because he treated her "right," with respect. She respected him and felt a responsibility toward him.

In another instance, Mrs. W.W. Wood of Marysville took me on a tour of her ranch last year, pointing out the housing she has for her family workers. She employs about 300 workers for a few weeks only each year. But these are the same families who come back year after year from Redlands; some have come for two generations. They wouldn't return if she didn't treat them with respect; she wouldn't ask them if they were not responsible and respectful of her needs.

The real tragedy of the start of the Bracero program was that old ties between employer and employee were broken, and that new relationships were required; now, those relationships must be severed, and we will have to initiate anew continuity and sound relations between employers and their workers. I'm certain that preserving feelings of mutual respect is central to the problem. Money counts, but it isn't absolutely everything. Farm workers are just as proud and independent by nature as growers--you can't force them to do things they don't want to, any more than you can farmers. Whether farm workers are alone or in a cooperative, a union or under contract, it takes the added element of respect (courtesy), to motivate them to work or be responsible. This respect has to be achieved and maintained for a long period of time. It can't be a crash program run by the government, either. Respect is too personal. It has to be worked out by each employer, each farmer, each foreman with each worker individually. Most of the growers here know this, and practice it themselves. It is far more difficult to achieve in large corporate agribusiness. There, how can you make sure that the foreman, the supervisory person, is courteous and treats his workers with genuine respect? Remote control will not do it.

As we have moved away from the family-sized farm, we have lost many fine values. The great challenge ahead is to make it possible for the farm workers and his family to find a dignified way of life within the framework of the giant corporation. General Motors did it. Corporate steel did it, after a fashion. Can agriculture do it?

In this setting, community attitudes can make a great difference. Just recently, I was impressed to observe a small interfaith conference, a minature replica of this one, in Gilroy, Santa Clara County. Each discussion section contained a good representation of farmers, farm workers, church and service professional workers. It was a most productive conference; everybody went away feeling that many good things were going to happen around Gilroy. The plain fact is that the place where action counts the most is on the local level. Here is the real challenge.

At this Conference, we have tried to open some channels of communication between groups who do not often meet. They have an important relationship to one another now.

We hope you have found someone new with whom you could talk to here--someone from another group than your own. Now, when you return home we hope you will try to sustain this communication with other groups.

This is our fourth Conference. Those of you who have attended the others are well aware that this is a slow process of patient effort to communicate--to work together--and that there is no one grand solution to our problems. They must be solved one at a time, little by little, and mostly at the community level.

Let us now all return to our homes--and see if we can help each other.

REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY GROUPS

Community Development
Education
Employee-Employer Relations
Health
Housing
Social Services

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

REPORT OF STUDY GROUP: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

STUDY GROUP STAFF

Chairman:	H. Parley Kilburn, Dean, Evening Division, Bakersfield College
Local Host:	Loren Voth, Farmer, Wasco
Recorder:	Dick Towse, Teacher, Wasco
Reporter:	Wayne C. Hartmire, Director, California Migrant Ministry

SUMMARY

The Community Development section focussed its attention on rural poverty -- particularly the flesh and blood problems and the real hopes of the men, women and children who inhabit our rural fringe communities.

In reviewing the past two years, it is clear that community development as a way of helping people is gaining stature. In rural California alone, six new community development projects have begun since the Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops met last in March 1962. A grant from the Rosenberg Foundation made possible a Symposium on Community Development in California in July 1963.*

The discussion of community development in this 1964 Conference began with the remarks of Edward P. Dutton of the Oakland Interagency Project:

> Farm workers are more and more settling in fringe areas; this provides the opportunity to involve these people in neighborhood and community activities. However, some feel that "such people don't want help"; others feel the enormity and complexity of the problem

---

* A report of this Symposium is available from the American Friends Service Committee, 304 S. Johnson Street, Visalia, California.

so strongly that they express despair at finding an adequate solution; some public and private agencies concerned with the problem seem determined "to get in on the ground floor ... let someone else worry about other services." There is need for a community-wide approach to solve these fringe area problems--one which recognizes that often people with great motivation can accomplish by deciding together what their own community problems are and then being helped to find ways to handle them.

Successful Programs

Some examples of successful rural community development programs in California are 1) Cesar Chavez's work with the Community Service Organization and the Farm Workers Association; 2) Bard McAllister's results in Tulare County; 3) Art Jenkins in Dos Palos; 4) and others.

Community development as an instrument for change depends upon the faith and creativity of "the little people" who compose our rural slums. Central is self-determination, contrasting with programs planned outside the neighborhood and imposed by professionals and lay leaders who "know" what is good for the problem community."

Approaches

There are at least two approaches to community development which can be contrasted. One position emphasizes the role of social action and the use of conflict situations to bring about social changes--demonstrations or aggressive power politics. The other focuses on developing cooperative relationships within the broad community as a tool for helping people--such as a Mayor's Committee on Human Relations or roundtable discussion groups. These two approaches can further be compared by measuring the degree to which the following human dynamics express themselves:

1. The degree to which Conflict or Cooperation is assumed to be a necessary prerequisite for the establishment of eventual change.

2. The degree to which Self-Interest or Altruism of persons in a community becomes the central reference for prediction of citizen reaction.

3. The degree to which Coercive Power or Education and Persuasive Negotiation are utilized as the primary instrument for social change.

4. The degree to which Partisan Identification by the community development worker with the cause of the "have nots" is necessary for effecting adequate social changes as compared with Identification with both (or several) Parties.

The most promising environment for helping the poverty-stricken person to learn skills of maturity is a community; the true test of citizenship in a democracy is participation in community affairs. A community is a place where people live together, are stimulated and responsible. An educative community is one on the move, in action, solving the problems of poverty through community education. People can be participant contributors to their own development.

Suggested Programs

Here are some programs which will illustrate community development in operation. A community development worker can help citizens organize neighborhood councils for self-improvement such as the united action by youth and parents to secure the use of the school gymnasium at night, active planning for a neighborhood health festival, a local clean-up campaign, inviting the county governmental officials and the local newspaper to recognize such local community efforts. A voters registration campaign, or a presentation by the citizens council before the Board of Supervisors, or the State Legislature, or a demonstration march are other areas for organized citizen involvement. To encourage and facilitate this type of growth is one of the most essential expressions of democratic life and one of the special functions of the community development worker.

Recommendations

To combat rural poverty in California, I recommend a community development program be adopted on a mass scale--by the University of California, Fresno State College Adult Education Extension, and by private agencies re-directing existing resources into community development programs. We can no longer plan for or tell the farm workers what is best for them. Community development is not a luxury; it is as essential as money in the bank, good health, adequate housing, or regular employment. Most important, it recognizes the dignity, the worth, and the strengths of the farm worker.

Following discussion, Community Development Section heard from three residents of rural fringe areas: Mrs. Jesse Ortega of Goshen, Mrs. Sally Galaviz of Wasco and Mr. Ellis Yarbrough of Fresno. The three panelists described in detail the origin of their communities, the problems they face and the realistic hopes people have for a new day. It was apparent that in all three areas, the realization of these hopes depends on the people working together on their own problems with limited enabling help from an outside agency or group.

On the second day of the Conference, Mr. David Burciaga described the activity of the Community Service Organization (CSO) with particular emphasis on the Service office program which requires that the people of the barrios pay adequately for services received in order to support staff, office expenses, etc. Mr. Arthur Jenkins described the work of the Disciples of Christ in Dos Palos. Working together with the California Migrant Ministry, the Disciples support Jenkins in a community development program that has united the residents of the Negro fringe area in combating job discrimination, low educational achievement, lack of water in homes, etc. Mrs. Jesse Ortega described the American Friends Service Committee program for self-help housing in Goshen and also told of the indigenous Community Center Organization there which is working toward a Community Center with the help of the United Church of Christ and the California Migrant Ministry.

Basic to all discussions of community development is faith in the power and creativity of the people who inhabit our rural fringe areas. Two years ago the Community Development Section made this statement: "... we recognize that farm workers are persons of worth, who, by and large, display the motivation and ability to deal with their own problems and to make significant cultural, social and economic contributions to the large community ..."

By community development we mean the fullest involvement of local people to develop the maximum potential of the individuals and the community with an enabling person as needed. A community development practitioner has coined the phrase: "A Dignity of Their Own."

Man's dignity is given--not earned. But that dignity must be experienced in the day-to-day business of life if any man is usefully to believe in his own worth.

One of the ways that men experience that God-given dignity is by working together in articulating and dealing with their own problems.

To the extent that they are denied this opportunity they are limited in their experience of self-worth.

To the extent that we deny them that opportunity we are ourselves responsible for trampling on the dignity of our fellow men.

We in the Community Development Section urge you to give all men--ourselves and others--the chance to be their own masters--to establish a dignity of their own.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of this definition, and the confidence we have in people to be masters of their own destiny, we recommend:

1. the encouragement of those governmental and non-governmental groups (i.e. local, state, national) which are planning and implementing programs to deal with rural poverty in our society, particularly to anticipate the alternative farm labor needs that may ensue at the end of Public Law 78. However, before any programs designed to reduce poverty are imposed on rural slum areas, we urge that the persons living in those areas who will be recipients of the services be involved in their planning.

2. further, that full citizen participation be elicited from established pertinent citizen groups (i.e., farmer, labor, and community councils and center boards, welfare and health advisory committees, advisory boards for work and training projects, etc.) to ensure that all segments of community life are represented and involved.

3. that governmental and non-governmental agencies who are involved in community organization and development find effective means to work together at all levels.

4. that a Center for Community Development be established in California, perhaps aligned to a graduate department of social work at a State college or University (e.g. Fresno State College Graduate program of social work). The Center would have four prime functions:

    a. to provide professional community development services;

    b. to train indigenous leaders from neighborhoods engaged in self-help;

    c. to train professional community development practitioners;

    d. to conduct research in this emerging social science.

5. that recruitment for the Study Group on Community Development at future Conferences be broadened to include many segments of community life, including fringe residents, agricultural employers, agency representatives, etc.

6. that in view of the movement in community development and the potential problems aggravated by the end of Public Law 78, the next Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops be held in one year.

REPORT OF STUDY GROUP: EDUCATION

STUDY GROUP STAFF

Chairman: Vernon L. Genesy, Superintendent of Cocoran Unified School District

Local Hosts: Harry E. Blair, Kern County Superintendent of Schools

Recorders: Ruth Overfield, Evelyn Walker, Maude Edmondson, Thelma Gomez, Daisy Strange

Reporters: Arthur Carlson, Leonard Swenson, Hugh Staley, Lawrence Riordan, June Stiern

SUMMARY

The Study Group on Education heard several papers on specific problems in obtaining and maintaining educational levels which beset the migrant farm family. Then the participants met in three sub-groups to deal with the particular education needs of the young child, the adolescent and the adult.

REALITY, RESPONSIBILITY AND RESPECT
IN THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN FROM FAMILIES WHO FOLLOW THE CROPS

Helen Heffernan, Chief
Bureau of Elementary Education
California State Department of Education

At first glance, the topical format (community development, education, employer-employee relations, health, housing and welfare) seems to be a logical organization of the various facets of society's responsibility to families who follow the crops. But they are psychologically and ethically so interrelated that no one can work intelligently on any aspect of human need without being knowledgeable about all aspects.

School people have learned long ago that you cannot teach hungry children, and hungry children come from families whose income is insufficient to provide proper nutrition. School people know that the individual human being is a unitary organism: if his body is suffering from illness or disease, if his teeth are in need of dental care, if his sight or hearing is impaired, his ability to learn is also seriously impaired. We cannot really consider the child's education without first considering his physical condition and health.

Every teacher knows that a child who feels self-conscious about either the quality or cleanliness of his clothing cannot give full attention to learning to read, to the understanding of mathematics, or to any other part of the educational program. Children whose clothing, grooming and use of language is similar to that of the culture in which the majority of the children were reared are likely to meet with acceptance, understanding, recognition and love by their age mates. It is unfortunately true that children whose behavior differs greatly from the social customs and mores are more likely to become the objects of rejection, hostility and aggression. Conditions which may seem superficial and insignificant to adults loom large with children and may actually create an antagonistic climate in which the "different" child finds it difficult to achieve.

The migrant child's task is not an easy one: he has grown up in a culture in which he has been taught how to act, to talk, to value himself, to adjust to his surroundings. He may find himself in a new social environment in which his language is unacceptable and in which his behavior does not conform. He has the difficult task of maintaining his personal integration and still remain open to different experiences. Therefore, education is closely related to community and family mores and welfare service.

Housing, too, is related to education. Many wise and sympathetic teachers are hesitant about giving homework assignments or even recommending out-of-school reading of library books when they know that the housing available to families who move with the crops affords no quiet or privacy, is poorly lighted, crowded and lacks minimum comforts conducive to study. Teachers know this can intensify the child's fear, frustration and inadequacy as he compares himself unfavorably with children from homes where assignments can be finished in good shape. Unfortunately this disadvantaged child is too immature to recognize these unequal conditions. He usually blames himself. His anxiety increases.

If our country and our State are to secure proper returns on our educational investment, we must create sound community conditions, provide protection from dire poverty, generously provide welfare, assure workers decent housing and extend to them the protection and and safeguards assured other workers. If we are genuinely concerned with reality we cannot view the problems of families who follow the crops in bits and pieces, but be willing to seek all the facts and act courageously.

What kind of education do we want for children whose families follow the crops?

Naturally, we want the very best we can devise for any children in our country.

All children want to learn.

My concern is how these learnings are presented.

More important than any specific subject matter learning are those which build a personality to help our children "learn how to learn" so they can acquire the new knowledge significant to them now and in their adult years.

The Elimination of Poverty

Of top priority, we must come to grips with the problem of poverty.

Professor J. K. Galbraith in "The Affluent Society," acknowledges two kinds of poverty-- "insular poverty," that suffered by people who live in the rural South, and "case poverty commonly and properly related to ... the characteristics of the individuals so afflicted ... such as mental deficiency, bad health, inability to adapt to the discipline of modern economic life, excessive procreation, alcohol, insufficient education." Perhaps insufficient education is the result of dire poverty rather than its cause. The young adolescent from the migrant family who attempts to secure a high school education finds that he may be rejected; he feels uncomfortable, unwanted, and unable to meet the school's standards in language and behavior. He is fearful of massive reprisals with which he may be frequently threatened. He drops out of school and faces a bleak future---"no room at the bottom."

Today, between 40 and 50 million Americans--about one-fourth of our population--live in real poverty. Is there an alternative? President Johnson says there is. The United States with seven percent of the world's population has 55 percent of the world's wealth. We can banish poverty if we wish and with it greatly reduce crime, disease, ignorance, and human misery.

If we are going to come to grips with poverty as it manifests itself most disastrously in the families who follow the crops we must provide a minimum wage, social security, unemployment insurance and all the other safeguards available to the general population.

Walter Simcich, research economist for the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, has suggested one solution to poor family housing would be to raise wages so as to increase the worker's ability to buy or rent good shelter.

> "We can take roughly the same degree of pride over the living conditions of California's agricultural workers as Governor (George) Wallace is entitled to over the state of civil rights in Alabama ... The economic and social circumstances of the farm workers and his family remain as much a state and national disgrace as ever, and in no area is this more true than with regard to their housing conditions."

Education is currently profoundly concerned with population movement and growth which has added a new and difficult dimension to an already difficult problem--the increase in pupil population from families in which a language other than English is spoken. During the past ten years California's Spanish-speaking population has increased 88 percent.[1]

The infiltration of thousands of families from the lower socioeconomic levels of Mexico means that the teaching of English as a second language becomes a problem requiring the attention of highly specialized teachers at a time when teacher shortage continues acute, and when the California Legislature takes an unrealistic view of the needs of a school system that serves 4,600,000 children and youth and which increased in the past year by more than a quarter of a million pupils.

---

[1] Based on a report by Julian Samora, The Education of the Spanish-Speaking in the Southwest. January 18, 1963.

Critical as the problems facing education may be, certain districts encouraged by local socially-minded leaders have moved to make special provisions. In Northern California, a summer program embracing a child care center for preschoolers and a summer school for school age children has operated for three years.

During the summer of 1963, the regional state college used the farm labor project as a center for observation and participation for prospective teachers. College students staffed the summer classes, provided evening classes in typing, stenography, electronics, conversational English for Spanish-speaking adults and staffed the library, stimulating its use and helping children to read.

The possibility of establishing more child care centers is also feasible. Many school districts now provide summer schools for elementary school children and any school district may do so. We are currently advising school districts where children reside whose families are employed in the crops to make additional educational opportunity available to compensate for loss of time as families move about the State.

Some districts provide places for study and recreation for children during the late afternoon and early evening. Volunteers are recruited to assist them with out-of-school assignments.

Several current programs should be extended to these children. The Compensatory Education Act should be adequately financed and put to use where the need is so great. The program of special classes in English for foreign-born minors in Imperial and San Diego Counties should be extended throughout the State for those who find regular school work difficult because of a language handicap.

The kindergarten day should be lengthened to 240 minutes and include a nourishing mid-day meal and a rest period of complete relaxation.

California will not meet the needs of its burgeoning population without greater financial support. Federal aid for education and greater equalization of the support of education will produce funds to meet the individual needs of our disadvantaged children.

Finally, we must find ways and means for fathers and mothers and teachers to work together in meeting the needs of children. The family is the most influential group in the child's life, the school comes second, and his companions come a close third. Understanding and cooperation are needed if good mothers and fathers and good teachers are to achieve the best for all our children.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

(Excerpts from the book by Hazel M. Lambert,* Asst. Professor of Education, Fresno State College, used as source material in the study group on early childhood)

The great interest in and concern over increased "dropouts" has focused public attention on the socio-economically deprived child. In current studies of disadvantaged children and youth great emphasis has been placed on the early years of life, for the earlier these children have group experiences with opportunities to socialize and verbalize, the greater hope of compensating for their cultural deprivation. Studies indicate that we cannot compensate at the primary grade age levels for deprivations of developmental experiences at ages three and four when children normally make strides in language development. Denied normal opportunities for such development constitutes an almost unsurmountable handicap in an education which gives high prestige to verbal achievement.

Providing stimulating experiences in a nursery school appears a promising way to help these young children to break through the language barrier, and stimulates social awareness influential upon adult character.

Children of harsh environments need experiences not enjoyed in privileged homes. In formative years they need opportunities to develop concepts about their world and to share in activities with children of about the same age. The good nursery school, through qualified teachers, proper equipment and materials, and an environment planned around the needs of the rapidly growing young child, supplements and extends the experiences offered the child in his home. Its program provides for appropriate continuity of learning and development.

The good nursery school also offers educational experiences to the parents of small children. Through observing the behavior of their young children in a group, consultation with teachers and directors, discussions with other parents, and participation in the school's program, parents learn to understand young children and acquire a knowledge of the principles of child guidance that carries over into the home. The good nursery school helps parents to act with more confidence and satisfaction.

The nursery school is a recent development in U. S. Education, dating from 1920. The early nursery schools in this country were established mainly as laboratories for child study, teacher education, home economics, and parent education by colleges and universities. Recent developments in education, pediatrics, biology, mental hygiene, and psychology, and the changes in American life--the growing number of working mothers, for one--are increasing public interest in the health, growth, and development of the nursery-age child.

---

* Early Childhood Education. Hazel M. Lambert. Allyn and Bacon, Rockleigh, New Jersey, 1963.

Children who go to school from a different cultural background need more than simple acceptance. They need to be ENJOYED in their DIFFERENTNESS--more than even other children.

The image the child has of himself is all important. He must be helped to meet hardships and realities in later life. He must be helped to gain insight, respect and confidence as a social human being.

Most significant is the dearth of private nurseries and day care centers and public child care centers in the rural agricultural valleys where they are so urgently needed.

REASONS FOR NON-ATTENDANCE AT SCHOOL APPROPRIATE FOR FARM LABOR CHILDREN

Non-attendance ("drop-out") at school may be caused by many factors.

A. Interest in school.

1. Doubt in the value of things studied. (Courses too far removed from every day agricultural life.)
2. Difficulty in expression (oral and/or written) and in proper study habits.

B. Rejections and/or failures in school.

1. Could have learned more in school but didn't try.
2. Did not know how to prepare for tests.
3. Some teachers are not interested in migrant students and seem too impersonal.

C. Student-Teacher Conflicts.

1. Would like to quit school because of failure to get along with a teacher.
2. Teachers expected too much of student.
3. Teachers were too strict and unreasonable.

D. Economic Needs.

1. Desire to quit school and work because of personal need of money for clothes and other necessities of life.
2. Must work to help family pay bills.

E. Sickness or Physical Handicap.

1. Health worries. (No pep, no appetite, stomach easily upset, frequent colds, headaches, etc.)
2. Eye, hearing, or dental problem.
3. Physical handicap of some nature.

F. Personal feelings in regards to home and family.

1. Receive no encouragement at home.
2. Ashamed to invite people to home.
3. Ashamed of parents and their worries. (Job, income group, dress, manners, etc.)

G. School social activities.

1. Local town kids seem to "run" things in the school activities.
2. Clothes not suitable for proper school social activities.

H. Personal Hygiene.

1. Poor camp lavatory facilities result in personal failure to maintain proper body cleanliness.
2. Unable to keep school clothes clean and neat due to general camp conditions.

I. Personal feelings in regards to self and others.

1. Racial or nationality problems.
2. Doubtful school future due to feeling that other students are more intelligent.
3. Difficulty in deciding between migrant camp standards and those of the local urban areas.
4. Feeling of not being wanted at school; feeling of being left out of things other kids do; and/or feeling of being different from other non-migrant children.

J. Other Reasons.

1. No shoes.
2. No clothes.
3. No lunch money.
4. Caring for younger children.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF INDIVIDUAL STUDY GROUPS ON EDUCATION

EARLY CHILDHOOD: Mrs. Theresa Mahler, Chairman.

The Study Group on Early Childhood, cognizant of the early influences on maturation and adult performance, therefore, recommends:

Educational Services

1. that educational services to young children be expanded and adequately supported in a variety of programs.

2. that groups and/or agencies working with families who follow the crops recognize the need to involve parents in planning for services which involve their children; specifically, that programs established provide opportunities of leadership from within the migrant farm family group.

3. further, that opportunities be provided for college students (particularly prospective teachers, social workers, etc.) to observe and participate in established programs for families who follow the crops.

Child Care Centers

4. support of supplemental appropriations of $132,000 for five Child Care Centers in rural areas and $84,000 for additional centers in urban or semi-rural areas, appropriations from Item #375 of the Governor's 1964-65 Budget. This will effect a greater balance: now there are 233 urban Child Care Centers and 10 in semi-rural areas.

5. expansion of the present California Child Care centers Program under the State Department of Education to serve especially the needs of young children in rural as well as urban areas.

6. the establishment of Child Care Centers offering meaningful programs for medical care, compensatory education and language training, in conjunction with summer schools for elementary school age children.

7. that the Legislature (at the next General Session) investigate and modify the present regulations to make it possible to establish Child Care Centers without requiring appropriations of funds specifically for each center, presently retarding this movement.

Study

8. that a study be undertaken of the extension of the kindergarten day to 240 minutes, with a reduced class load for the teacher.

9. formation of a committee representing appropriate State departments and/or lay and professional groups to develop plans for buildings suitable for various types of pre-school programs.

THE MIDDLE YEARS: Afton Nance, Chairman

In recognition of the needs to maintain educational services especially during the developmental years, the Study Group on Middle Years recommends:

Legislation

10. State legislation to provide greater equalization for the support of education, increasing the proportion of expense borne by the State.

11. that the Compensatory Education Act be adequately financed and applied where the need is greatest.

12. Federal legislation providing broad support for all levels of education.

Services

13. the extension of branch library services to regions where farm laborers reside and the establishment of adequate school libraries and study centers.

14. the establishment of summer schools in all areas in which migrants are located.

15. the program of Special Classes in English for foreign-born minors (being conducted in Imperial and San Diego Counties) be extended throughout the State to assist those who are handicapped in school performance because of language.

16. the provision of family-life education programs in the schools.

Study

17. a study of the extension of the school day and school year, considering the feasibility of adopting the quarter system.

Equal Opportunities

18. that the same basic financial safeguards provided other laborers be extended to farm laborers.

19. that parents, P.T.A. members and other public and private agencies engage in concerted efforts to provide equal educational opportunities that each child may attain his full potential and responsibility as a productive citizen of a democratic society.

ADULTS: Stanley Sword, Chairman

The Study Group on Adults, recognizing the continuing educational needs of adults, particularly those whose earlier formal education has been limited, recommends:

Evaluation Services

20. establishment of a community-coordinating body to assess basic educational and training needs, serve as a clearing house, and develop ways of meeting these needs through formal and informal approaches. Representation from health, education, welfare, churches and other service organizations is recommended.

21. the development of methods to obtain information about the migrant and his family useful in guiding them toward appropriate education and training.

Study

23. further study of the basic needs to bridge the gap in education and training needs essential for worker to reach a level where he can use formal training.

REPORT OF STUDY GROUP:

EMPLOYEE-EMPLOYER RELATIONS IN AN UNCERTAIN FUTURE

STUDY GROUP STAFF

Local Host:	Richard Lemmon, Manager, California Department of Employment, Bakersfield
Moderator:	Varden Fuller, Ph.D., Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of California, Berkeley
Recorder:	Margot Lenhart, Farm Placement Supervisor, California Department of Employment
Reporter:	Joseph Gunterman, Legislative Advocate for Friends Committee on Legislation

SUMMARY

When you talk about employer-employee relations you talk about wages and working conditions, about things that mean a great deal to both the employer and the employee. To the grower, you are talking about costs that may affect seriously his ability to support his family through farming, and to the farm worker you are talking about the daily bread and butter of his family. Similarly, when you say that growers scheme to keep down wages or that workers don't do a good job, you are hitting at the pride and self-respect of the individuals on the other side of the arguments.

It is perhaps surprising, therefore, that this section was able to reach agreement on anything.

Throughout the two days of discussion, the presumed dead Bracero program was brought up again and again. As far as this section is concerned, it is a very lively corpse.

Speakers for the growers brought forth this point of view in regard to farm workers: a major fault of farm workers is that they don't stay on the job. There is need for training, especially of foremen. New efforts are being made, and will be made, to utilize the existing labor force efficiently. There are limitations to this efficient utilization which are caused by weather and market conditions. The grower is unable to raise wages very much because he has no way of forcing more money out of the market. Present unemployment insurance and welfare regulations make people unwilling to accept farm jobs. Larger numbers of students can be used, but to make the maximum use of them the start of school should be moved up to October or November.

From the worker's viewpoint, the situation was described as follows:

> Pay for farm work is too low. Workers keep moving because they are looking for higher earnings. Farmers want to have more workers than they need in order to keep wages down. They use the existing labor force inefficiently, are guilty of poor scheduling. Farm workers need organization and collective bargaining. The provisions that cover Braceros in regard to a minimum wage, guaranteed amount of work, housing and transportation should be given to farm workers.

Presentations of the two days--

-Identified some of the problems of agricultural employment;

-Described some of the projects and proposals for improving and stabilizing agricultural employment;

-Provided a look into the future as to trends in mechanization, training of farm workers, and other measures to improve utilization of farm power.

SESSIONS I & II: What are the principal problems of agricultural employment in California?
2-27-64

(Excerpts by speakers in the order given)

RAYMOND F. ROTH, CHIEF OF FARM PLACEMENT, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

General Problem

Unemployment and farm labor shortages exist at the same time: people are at one place while jobs are at another; they may not desire, or be suited for, the type of work offered, or be able to move to the work area. In our free labor market, people have the right to refuse unwanted work and cannot be forced to move.

At the same time, there often are workers who can and will move, who are qualified for distant jobs, and will accept them--providing the job offers favorable wages, conditions, possible advancement of transportation, and the assurance of suitable quarters to live in. It is believed that more unemployed people can be channelled into farm work with favorable job inducements.

Department of Employment highway signs direct workers to local offices where statewide "Farm Labor Information" is available from the Weekly Farm Labor Report. Despite these facilities, as well as cooperative publicity of job information via radio, TV, and press, many people who could find gainful employment and job satisfaction in agriculture do not get the word.

Mutual Problem

Employer dissatisfaction with worker qualifications and efforts; worker dissatisfaction with employer job offer and job conditions.

New Programs

One program of the Departments of Employment and Education is the farm Manpower Development Training (MDT) whereby, in less than a year, some 500 farm workers have been taught new skills and farmers have been quick to hire the newly trained workers.

Another experimental program is the training of farm foremen in the job instruction and supervision, with the aim of improving human relations on the job.

These two programs hold promise in raising the status of agricultural employment for both employers and workers.

JOHN N. DUNGAN, PRESIDENT, TULARE COUNTY FARMERS' ASSOCIATION

Seasonal labor demand and housing problem

The seasonal aspect of farm labor needs gives birth to most of the problems; the farmer assumes risks at planting time--that there will be a good crop, and enough labor to harvest it, depending on a mobile labor supply despite the inadequacy of housing. The seasonal need for hossing discourages the investment of private funds; yet, public funds have been limited for this purpose despite urban renewal projects, slum clearance, and other low income housing for city dwellers.

Labor supply and labor turnover

Inadequacy of employment records and labor requirement statistics make it difficult to estimate needs. Turnover may be heavier than expected. The Tulare County Farmers' Association organized a pilot crew, furnishing work the year around. The crew stayed in one place, but members came and went. Worker output is also uncertain because they don't all work at the same speed or for the same number of hours. One farmer hired over 800 men to fill a crew of 80 - 100 men. How can he estimate his requirements for next year? And how can we estimate how many domestic workers it will take to replace 40,000 Braceros. Probably 20-25 percent more work could be done if workers did not mill around and if all the available time were used during the harvest period. Weather and pro rate interrupt work.

Farm wages

Wages paid agricultural workers, while not high, are better than averages indicate. It is the loss of available work time and the part-time worker that lowers the averages.

DONALD L. POLLARD, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATION OFFICER, CITY OF FRESNO

There is a project to establish, in the City of Fresno, a 16-acre Migrant Labor Center for housing single men. The Center would occupy an area to be made available by tearing down blocks including slum dwellings now occupied by such individuals. The pro-

Migrant Labor Center — posed center, which may be financed by a $400,000 grant, will include a health clinic and possible related facilities. The Migrant Labor Center is part of a renewal program of the City of Fresno and financing is expected to include a demonstration fund grant through the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

RAUL AGUILAR, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AGRICULTURAL WORKERS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE AFL-CIO

(Statement read by Violet Rotan)

Personal History — A Texan, I migrated to California with my family 18 years ago and settled in Soledad. With farm earnings and work on a construction job, we started a small grocery. Most customers were field workers. When Mexican Nationals were used, displaced local workers moved out. Wages went down and customers were lost.

In 1955, we closed our business and moved to Stockton where we had to start all over again, picking tomatoes at 13 cents a box and doing hourly work at 90 cents an hour.

With the help of some labor leaders, I was able to get a job in a local cannery where I worked until I was offered the job I now hold.

J. LELAND EMBREY, DISTRICT MANAGER, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, BAKERSFIELD

(Unscheduled Speaker)

OASDI for farm workers — Old age, Survivors, and disability insurance benefits are available to the farm worker and his family as well as to other workers or self-employed people in our nation. Benefits must be applied for the provisions of entitlement must be clearly understood if the worker and his family are to receive their fair share of the benefits.

What can the migrant worker do to become eligible for Social Security benefits to which he is entitled?

1. Possess a Social Security Card and make sure it is presented to each crew leader or farmer when reporting for a job;

2. Make sure wages are correctly reported and check with Social Security Administration each year to see that all wage reports and Social Security deductions were correct. (The Social Security office has a booklet for keeping a record of earnings, and a form for the annual checking of reported wages and deductions.)

3. Avoid job hopping. Stay with one employer until paid at least $150 in cash wages, so that wage credits can be added to the Social Security account.

4. Check with Social Security office at age 62 to find out eligibility for benefits even though still employed.

Social Security district offices are located throughout the nation to serve covered workers.

Additional Information Introduced In Discussion:

1. Low earnings by farm workers are sometimes due less to the wage than to underemployment caused by weather, prorate, and similar factors which interrupt work.

2. Workers may leave an area of continuing employment in order to take advantage of higher potential earnings in a short harvest of a highly perishable crop in another area.

3. Alien immigrants under Public Law 414, Section 212 (a)(14), from Mexico have permanent visas, "Green Card," and become part of the domestic farm work force. They are covered by Social Security and other programs covering domestic farm workers.

4. If farm wage rate increases could be passed on directly to the consumer, the retail price might reflect very little increase. The problem would be how to have the consumer pay the cost of the increased farm wage rate.

SESSION III: What projects and activities are going on in California that have special significance for employing and stabilizing employment in agriculture?

COBEY LORENZE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

In 1940, the country's farmer produced food for himself and ten others. By 1960, he was feeding himself and ten others. The California farmer has done at least as well--nor has the limit been reached or even approached. Potential now is placed at a ratio of one to 45. The progress resulted from increased efficiency and greater use of machinery.

Mechanization

Examples of activities in which new mechanization can improve and stabilize employment in agriculture:

1. Tomato harvest--mechanization and a specially designed plant permit the picker to become a sorter, riding on the machine, and performing a different operation which, with proper management, can result in a more uniform product delivered to the processor.

2. Citrus harvest--a mechanical aid can help the operation by increasing the efficiency of the worker. This may even require retraining of the hand laborer but, again, can result in a better product and upgrading of the worker.

3. Asparagus harvest--California's advantage here is the production of white asparagus as contrasted with green. One particular harvest operation could result in a so-called missed cut, yielding both green and white spears. A simplified operation, combined with more complex sorting, could result in a more efficient system and more acceptable product.

Complete mechanization of an agricultural commodity does not occur suddenly, nor does it bring drastic changes over night. Fifteen years of work and several false starts went into the development of the cotton picker. Ten years of fundamental study had been accumulated at the time the pressures of labor--or lack of labor--forced the first university pilot model of the tomato harvester. The orderly development of mechanization in agriculture will continue, to the benefit of both grower and worker. Cultural changes will continue as an important factor. At present, 70 percent of all United States crop land is planted to varieties which were non-existent 20 years ago.

KIRKE WILSON, MANAGER, SEQUOIA FARM LABOR ASSOCIATION, VISALIA

Farm labor cooperative

The Sequoia Farm Labor Association is a cooperative organization owned by about 200 seasonal farm worker members, and operated by a staff and a board of directors. The cooperative contracts with farmers to do their work assists employers in hiring additional workers. The cooperative maximizes employment of members by scheduling work ahead, and in cooperation with the farmers, plans and effects crew transfers.

The cooperative wasstarted in 1960 under the sponsorship of the American Friends Service Committee. Advantages of the cooperative have included improvements in skills and quality of work, personal motivation, and group responsibility.

Earnings

Annual average earnings for a single member have been about $2,000. The cooperative has voluntary coverage in unemployment insurance. Opportunities for training and profit sharing add incentives for the member.

O.W. FAHRNEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, TULARE COUNTY FARMERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Growers organization

This Association is interested in all possible approaches to increased productivity of the workers in the employ of grower members. The Association recognizes that increased earnings for these and other agricultural workers can come only from improved methods, increased skills, and added incentives which enable employees to become more productive, thus providing the means for paying increased individual earnings.

Studies proposed

The Association asked the University of California College of Agriculture to undertake studies to improve agricultural methods, efficiency, and incentive wage structure.

Pilot crews

A pilot crew of typical workers was developed under the direction of the Association. The workers received training in new skills; efforts were made to stabilize and extend their employment. Progress yielded findings which were both discouraging and gratifying: for workers left the opportunity for nearly steady employment close to home, to follow other work patterns. Yet, there was little, if any, difficulty in training workers as the crew moved from one activity to another. Many of the workers learned skills that they had never attempted before: thinning, harvesting, and pruning.

Training and supervision

The Association learned early in the pilot crew study that supervision and training were the keys to success. The inability to find enough qualified supervisors limited expansion in the number of crews and led to consideration of setting up a supervisor's training course.

Fuller utilization of the Association's work force, through a crew exchange program, made good progress and benefitted both growers and workers.

NORMAN SMITH, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, AGRICULTURAL WORKERS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Responsibility for taking positive action on the farm labor problem has been shunned for years by both farm owners and organized labor. When AFL-CIO set out to organize farm labor in 1959, the funds provided were small for such an effort and further funds were not provided.

The AFL-CIO was largely responsible for killing Public Law 78 and the Bracero Program, by bringing pressure on Congress and the administration.

The Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee expects to get some contracts this year. The AWOC has contributed to the promotion of cooperative efforts to stabilize labor.

JACK MILLER, SECRETARY-MANAGER, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS LABOR COMMITTEE, LOS ANGELES

A large segment of California's farm work is made up of year-round workers employed at good wages. Farmers do face a responsibility to replace 70,000 Braceros and they intend to do it. But if there are not enough workers for the peaks of perishable harvests, California's production and $3½ billion farm income will decline.

Imports of agricultural produce from Mexico have increased during the past five years: imports of winter tomatoes increased from 25 million to 161 million pounds; imports of spring tomatoes increased from 15 million to 64 million pounds; and imports of strawberries rose from 10 million to 13 million pounds. The agricultural industry, in the statement of John V. Newman to the State Board of Agriculture, February 17, 1964, accepted the fact that "an extension of Public Law 78--the Bracero Program--is not in the cards". Such acceptance was in "recognition of what has been stated to be the will of the people as expressed by members of Congress". The statement referred to proposed studies "to determine the actual number of farm workers needed in California, county-by-county, crop-by-crop, month-by-month, to determine exactly the number and type of jobs that must be filled and the duration of employment involved ....it is considered imperative that this study also include a mechanization survey concerning the agricultural job opportunities available in 1965,66,67, and for the following six or seven years."

Also requested was a statewide study to determine the number of men and women who would be willing and able to perform various farm tasks, a study to include "all Californians presently drawing unemployment insurance, relief and welfare payments, etc., ... estimates as to their transportation and housing requirements, and wages at which they would be willing to perform this work."

Farmers' Harvest Association

The Farmers' Harvest Association is a cooperative with the objective to recruit and refer domestic workers for members; to develop a work force which will be satisfactory for its availability and stability.

By the end of February, 1964, the Association expects to have one thousand workers from Texas, and expects to maintain complete records on recruitment costs, the duration of employment, earnings, etc. From ten to twelve months of employment will be offered, primarily in citrus and avocado picking. An identification card system has been adopted to identify workers who have demonstrated their skill and willingness to pick citrus and transfer between locations of need. This is expected to save time when the citrus season comes again. Training of workers is an accompanying part of the program.

ROBERT A. CHAPMAN, MANAGER, FRESNO FARM LABOR PROJECT

Fresno Project

The Fresno Project, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, and the California Department of Employment, Farm Labor Service, was set up to evaluate existing services and programs for agricultural employers and workers and to intensify operations and explore possibilities for increased effectiveness and penetration in farm labor service.

Programs

Some of the programs receiving special attention include (1) worker registration--a study of application taking; (2) worker training--up-grading skills through the MDT program; (3) criteria for farm labor offices; (4) agricultural employer hiring practices--including the roles of the farm labor contractor, packer, and shipper; (5) failure of workers to respond when called in for a referral, and failure to report to employer after being selected and referred; (6) characteristics of the farm work force.

Progress reports on these subjects have been issued. In general, there has been considerable progress in gaining knowledge of the area served and effecting improvements in farm labor service operations.

SESSION IV: 2-28-64

What is the future outlook for agricultural employment in California? What must be done to insure maximum conservation and utilization of manpower resources in this field?

GLENN E. BROCKWAY, REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR, BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY, REGION X U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, SAN FRANCISCO

The end of Public Law 78 occasions speculations about our farm employment future.

The extremes of opinion extend from the allegation that the future holds nothing but unmitigated disaster for California's farmers to the notion that the end of foreign labor will mean a new birth of freedom for all of us.

What, indeed, appear to be the main trends having significance for California's agricultural employment future?

Trends

The trend of farm employment in the United States is down. Yet, what I regard as a miracle--of science, technology, of good management and effectively applied labor--has more than doubled the output per manhour worked in this country in little more than a decade--1950 to 1962.

If we use 1950 as an index, the number of all workers on farms in the United States fell from 100 in 1950 to 72 in 1962. (Because of the emphasis on labor-intensive crops in California it dropped only from 100 to 86 over these same years.)

More important are the studies of acreages coming into production, farmers' plans and the probable speed of mechanization in reducing the labor needs of crops prominent in California agriculture. All of these indicate that given anything approaching a relationship between labor demand and labor supply that is economically feasible for the grower, the employment of seasonal farm labor is not going to diminish appreciably in California over the next few years, no matter what may occur nationwide.

We can then agree that a need for farm labor in this State is not a problem that we can simply wish away. The greater use of chemicals, machinery, or improved farm methods in general, will change labor needs, sometimes radically in certain crops and certain areas. But these developments will not produce gross changes in the total California farm labor situation in and of themselves in this decade.

Now, employers do tell us that if seasonal farm labor becomes scarce they will reduce the acreage of labor-intensive crops. Thus, there is a rather better chance of decreasing labor need in the comparatively near future from this element of voluntarism in the picture than from the inevitable forward march of farm mechanization.

If shortages of seasonal farm labor were to become significant, several potential trouble spots and problem areas come immediately to mind.

Tomatoes, lettuce, strawberries, oranges, lemons, sugar beets, asparagus, celery and dates raised in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, the Central and South Coast Areas and the Desert Area--all would have grave difficulties in the face of a short supply of seasonal farm labor.

But--can we be sure that the future outlook for agricultural employment includes a crucially short supply of seasonal farm workers as an inevitable follow-up to the end of Public Law 78? Who could perform this work?

1) Green card holders, 2) domestic seasonal workers displaced from agriculture in other areas of the United States at a time when manufacturing, construction, transportation, and mining are not supplying alternate job opportunities for these people. 3) a better conserved and utilized manpower resource seasonal farm labor.

I firmly believe that the better utilization of our already available farm labor supply would be good business for the farmer, just as the increasingly good utilization of the industrial worker has added to the nonfarm employer's prosperity.

There will assuredly be localized shortages if not a general dearth of needed labor. A better conservation and utilization of available workers is an alternative not to be overlooked.

We are speaking in very impersonal terms--of the "conservation and utilization of manpower resources." Necessarily, we are deeply concerned with such economic verities as the demand for and supply of farm labor. But, we must be thinking also of individuals, who are or who can become full-fledged citizens of this nation, voters with a voice in its affairs, parents of school children, consumers as well as producers in our economy, stable citizens in decent communities.

HOW are we to reach these goals?

What can we in the public employment service business contribute to the better conservation and utilization of farm manpower resources?

We in farm labor service here in California (both federal and state) number less than 500 persons against a labor force in agriculture of some 500,000--deployed in more than 200 crops and working in every corner of the State.

Nonetheless, I am as proud of what we have tried to accomplish in the past, particularly the recent past, with respect to farm labor utilization, as I am confident that we will increase our efforts, and results, in this direction in the future.

Of what do our efforts consist in helping to insure a maximum conservation and utilization of farm manpower?

First, we are greatly intensifying our efforts to identify local farm workers as individuals. Only knowledge in this degree of detail can provide the necessary foundation for adequate employment service both to the worker and to the grower.

We are trying to find out who these workers are and what their work history may be. What are their skills and qualifications as of now? What could they be trained to do? When are there open periods in their work schedules? What do they want to do in these periods? Are there unmanned work-stations in the same or neighboring localities during the same time periods?

Interstate migration

What we are learning in situations where we have been able to explore the facts more fully than we ordinarily can--on the Fresno Project and in California's Disability Insurance records--indicates that fewer of our seasonal farm workers migrate across state lines than we thought previously. Constructing a fuller schedule of jobs for a worker's year-long program, consequently, may pose less of a problem of travel and communication in very many instances than we have believed to date.

The information we are gaining enables us to piece out a full work schedule for the applicant and to fill employer labor needs even now (in other words, to conserve and to utilize farm manpower). It enables our local farm labor offices to become true selection and referral agencies rather than mere centers for the mass movement of casual workers.

Annual Worker Plan

Second, we are intensifying our efforts with respect to the Annual Worker Plan. The term "annual worker plan" as we use it in the service is reserved for bringing order and advanced scheduling into the inter-state migrations of workers and worker groups, by organizing in tandem series, a number of jobs to which migrants, with certainty, may move after each successive job is finished. In 1962 contact was made with 9,200 migrant worker groups--204,000 individual farm workers--from 34 different states.

The success of such a program hinges on the existence of a corps of dependable workers whose qualifications and needs we have ascertained; of a group of dependable employers who have defined their labor needs to us in adequate detail; and of an effective and extensive communication system linking them both. This program is comparable to that for professional workers (where, incidentally, we also have a national labor market, though for other reasons).

Youth Programs

Third, we have been emphasizing youth programs in conjunction with harvest labor needs, a service of our farm labor service offices. The employment of youth in California agriculture cannot be successful when it is haphazard. Needed is an adequate knowledge of the employer's labor needs; of what jobs youths can handle adequately; of methods of supervising these youth crews so they will perform satisfactorily; of crop timing; and of the requirements of the school year.

The stakes are high for the success of this program. If it does succeed, we will have taken care of some of the more troublesome peaks in our crop calendar--strawberries could be an example. Also, if we do succeed, we have a chance to bring certain imponderables such as good work habits and a sense of responsibility to a generation whose sense of values has been too much shaped by our urban culture.

Our plans and programs are designed to reduce the necessity for large scale migration of farm workers or, where workers plainly wish to migrate or must do so, of making this migration more orderly.

They are directed towards raising the income of farm workers, both local and migrant, by affording them greater services when they are in the job market.

Far too many among those who are coming to be known as the "forgotten fifth" (that one out of every five families earning less than $3,000 yearly) are migrant workers following harvests. Many are families of local farm workers.

Poverty

The total average wage of farm laborers in 1962 was only $1,164 and that figure includes work in non-farm odd jobs. For farm labor alone the average, nationwide, was $913. This, indeed, is poverty as well as an indication of poor utilization of our manpower resources.

Some workers may always want to follow the crops and we, as government, are not here to tell them what they can and cannot do. Rather it is our job to help them to migrate in a fashion that will best utilize their skills and best give farm employers the labor supply they need when it is needed.

Training

However, over the long haul I believe we will find more and more workers in settled communities, putting together a satisfactory year's work with a succession of jobs requiring different skills and capacities, or working throughout the year for a single farm employer on highly mechanized operations. These workers will be well trained--possibly because of an Area Development Training program. They will provide a dependable and qualified labor supply for California's agriculture. This work force will have come to appreciate the responsibility they bear for constituting a stable and productive work force. In turn, they will come to enjoy certain protections now extended only to the non-farm work force--such as unemployment insurance and the minimum wage.

This type of farm work force with its necessary concomitant of a body of farm employers who have defined their labor needs and who are using the best practices of good management constitute two prerequisites--for both the maximum conservation and utilization of our manpower resources in agriculture and an essential victory in the war against poverty.

HERMAN GRABOW, REPRESENTING THE CALIFORNIA STATE GRANGE, SACRAMENTO

Through the years people have been leaving the nation's farms. How are you going to get them back? In California, we lose one farm every day. Farms are getting larger, partly because of the necessity to lower costs. Mechanization is requiring more knowledge and it is going to be tougher for unskilled workers to get jobs. Diversification in agriculture and larger farms mean longer employment periods, more machines, and fewer workers.

Some of the changes appear to be taking place too rapidly to benefit employers and workers. For example, the tomato harvesting machine has been developing more rapidly than the tomato variety suitable for mechanical handling.

We have raised our educational standards and education of the masses has brought about a change in work preferences. People do not like to work with their hands but prefer to work with their brains.

There needs to be improved skill in handling workers. We need to train supervisors. With the end of PL 78, what do we do? Many suggestions have been presented here. Youth should be used. High schools and colleges should be put on the quarter system. August, September, and October are the critical months and the school system might be adapted to allow greater participation of students in farm work during this quarter. Keep the children in school the rest of the year.

WALTER SIMCICH, RESEARCH DEPARTMENT, CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION, AFL-CIO SAN FRANCISCO

I'd like to qualify my remarks as my own personal views rather than a statement of the Federation itself.

In his address State Farm Bureau President Allan Grant made the following statement regarding renewal of Public Law 78:

"We feel that we are not in a position to ask for any such extension until we have exhausted every possible avenue of obtaining an adequate labor force."

The very first step is to attempt a definition of the problem in straightforward terms.

I regret to say that the eminent spokesman for the growers fell disturbingly short of doing this. Part of his statements concerned an alleged need to replace

120,000 Braceros in California. He indicated that even if the Farm Placement Service really extended itself, and that if various labor-saving aids and mechanization developments materialized, the need would be cut in half, still leaving the industry some 60,000 workers short of its needs.

Statistics

This does seem to be a misleading statistic. The 120,000 figure represents a simple head count over 12 months time. It includes the Bracero who came for 6 weeks of work in January and returned to Mexico in February, never to return again. It counts each Bracero who came for various periods and at different junctures throughout the year. It would be just as meaningful to add up all the Braceros who have entered the State during the past 5 years and suggest that this represents the number of new workers required.

Clearly the only kind of Bracero count is the number working in the State at a given point in time. For example, the peak seasonal utilization of Braceros in 1963 took place in mid-October, at which time there were 61,200 Nationals in California.

The total hired farm labor force numbered 278,000. Over 208,000 of these- or 75% of the total were Californians, 9 out of 10 coming from the local area in which they worked. Aside from the 61,000 Braceros. the only other hired workers involved were 8700 interstate migrants.

As President Gruhn has pointed out, if the conditions of the job in 1963 could attract only 8700 interstate migrants, one would have to be somewhat out of touch with reality to even dream that essentially the same wages and working conditions would entice the bulk of the 61,000 Bracero replacements from out-of-state sources in 1965. Mr. Grant also repeated the estimate that 40,000 families would move into California. He mentioned some impressive sums needed for school construction and teacher salaries to accomodate the children in these families. Thus, before the studies have even been authorized - not to speak of completed - Mr. Grant and others have volunteered to the taxpayers of California that, on this one item alone, an immediate outlay of $63,000,000 in public funds would be necessitated. Similarly other allustions to potential costs of social welfare, health care etc. are volunteered.

These alarums are seemingly being delivered up and down the State every hour on the hour. While there is a once-over lightly mention of some vague intent to intensify recruitment in California the overall impression is that a wholesale campaign is underway to persuade the entire State that is has somehow become trapped into a venture that threatens to fleece the State Treasury and the general taxpayer.

Furthermore, the plight of the people of an underdeveloped country -- and who can help but symphathize with this plea -- is invoked although these same voices are strangely silent with respect to the poverty of farm workers in this very country.

Moreover, vastly increased consumer prices for food and fibre are being threatened with increasing regularity. The canning tomato industry which alone accounts for the bulk of the peak season Bracero employment in this State is a case in point. Until 1963, the prices received by the grower for a ton of tomatoes averaged close to $23 during most of the last decade. This same ton of tomatoes, sold in 2-lb. cans at the supermarket, yields in excess of $250.

Even if farm wages doubled, and the entire cost was passed to the consumer, it would raise the supermarket price on 2-lb. of tomatoes by 1¢ per can, from 25¢ up to 26¢. The example of tomatoes is very much the rule rather than the exception. Yet such groundless fears concerning consumer price rises are being willfully circulated today by people who can't help but know better.

We are confronted basically with two problems:

The Problems

(1) Depressed annual incomes for farm workers arising from low wages, unnecessarily restricted work opportunities, and various disabilities under the law such as their exclusion from UI coverage;

(2) Some growers, particularly those blessed with membership in the select five percent of all California farms who hire over 61% of all farm labor, are in need of replacing a temporary foreign labor supply with a stable domestic work force in adequate numbers to do the job.

Some of the steps that are needed to meet these problems are strictly in the growers' hands. Obviously the immediate job of adjusting wage rates to bring this industry into the 20th century is one. Similarly, there should be no delay in providing toilet facilities to make this work somewhat more acceptable to workers of either sex. Transportation and other benefits, such as the 3/4 time work guarantee, equal to those already afforded the Bracero, should be invoked immediately.

Basic to the entire concept of bringing a degree of order and stability to the farm labor force is the necessity to afford these workers the same opportunity long enjoyed by virtually all other Americans: forming unions of their own choosing for the purpose of participating in the decision-making processes regarding the conditions of employment.

Governmental Action

Until this is done, either through governmental action or by voluntary decision on the part of the growers, interim steps must be taken by the State to ensure that its first responsibility in this situation is met. This responsibility is not, as has been implied, one of guaranteeing the employers a labor source. Neither the State nor the Federal government has any such responsibility to this industry nor to any other industry. The responsibility of the State is to be helpful but on condition that it is not injuring the rights of the rest of the citizenry. The responsibility to attract, develop and to hold a labor force belongs, in this industry as everywhere else, to the employers alone. It can be met fundamentally only by beginning the job of becoming competitive with other American employers.

The State's responsibility is primarily to facilitate this process in every possible way and, most particularly, by extending to this industry the basic democratic right of employees to select a union of their own choosing for collective bargaining purposes.

In conclusion, I mention three more immediate ways in which the State could facilitate the stabilization and development of the domestic farm labor force: (1) implementing the Annual Worker Plan; (2) initiating procedures to insure that the right to crew referral could be placed in effect in the most meaningful manner; and (3) utilization of the union hiring hall as a central dispatching point in much the same spirit and manner that the State has conducted its relationship in the past with the employer associations under Bracero Program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Perhaps more than in the other study groups, that dealing with Employee-Employer Relations struck at the fundamental core of the Conference, for it is by employment that the farm laborer and his family are distinguished from other individuals. The Study Group on Employee-Employer Relations focussed on three basic subjects: identification of problems produced by agricultural employment; review of projects and proposals for improving and stabilizing agricultural employment; consideration of the influences of mechanization, training and other improvements which will change the nature of agricultural employment.

The Study Group on Employee-Employer Relations reached concurrence on a number of conceptual and practical measures, and therefore recommends:

Training Needs

1. that since the long-term trend in farm labor requirements is for fewer, but skilled, workers, training for farm workers should be extended to improve their skills.

2. that training for employers and foremen be encouraged to improve labor-management relations in the field, reduce labor turnover and improve job conditions for workers.

Analysis and Cooperation

3. that more thorough analysis of farm labor employment and requirements be conducted, including possible extension of transferring crews of workers among associations of growers.
4. that farm management, labor and government should continue to devote their individual and collective efforts toward closing the gap in their interests to their mutual benefit and toward fulfillment of the worthy objectives described by employer and labor representatives during the Conference.

Study

5. that a study be conducted to include:

    a. a five-year projection of farm labor needs in California;

    b. an analysis of the present labor supply;

    c. the wage-paying ability of growers, both small and large;

    d. the impact on the schools and other community agencies--law enforcement, welfare, health--of importing additional workers.

REPORT OF STUDY GROUP: HEALTH

STUDY GROUP STAFF

Local Host:	DeWitte T. Boyd, M.D., Kern County Health Officer
Moderator:	Arthur C. Hollister, Jr., M.D., Director of Research, California State Department of Health
Recorder:	Laura Bolt, Nutritionist, Kern County Health Department
Reporter:	Grace Finnegan, Nutrition Consultant, California State Department of Health

SUMMARY

The Study Group on Health drew considerable interest from the breadth of its participation. The panel reports, through which most information was given, were designed to draw together ideas of many disciplines working toward one objective: to upgrade the conditions of work and living for farm worker families. Panel reports were given by farm workers themselves, professionals in medicine, health, welfare, housing, employment, and agriculture.

Because the stimulation and maintenance of health depends on general living conditions, the recommendations by the Study Group on Health extended across topical lines. A number of them are concerned with the detailed mechanisms necessary to improve the overall health status of farm worker families, by stressing preventive as well as therapeutic means. Considerable emphasis was given also to ameliorating the present situation which makes obtaining health services difficult and often prohibitive.

EXCERPTS FROM PANEL REPORTS

How Professionals View It: A Reactor Panel

Private Medicine - Carroll Goss, M.D. - Most of the problems which focus on health needs of migrant farm families hinge on their mobility. The farm worker population, as a whole, is stabilizing. The fundamental problem is that of sanitation--simple lack of soap and water.

Voluntary Health Agencies - Duane O. Crummett, Ph.D. - Voluntary health agencies could assist in solving some of the problems raised by the workers by:

1) doing more to promote and provide practical health education on specific, indigenous health problems;

2) underwrite the cost of a project to provide private medical care; these areas of need should be brought to their attention;

3) promote and support legislation related to health needs;

4) assist farm workers in obtaining driver's licenses as a project;

5) interpreting to communities the need for day care centers, public health facilities, vaccination and accident prevention programs, community dental clinics;

6) provide or arrange for transportation to medical care facilities;

7) arrange for volunteer interpreters to translate for patients and staff at clinics and hospitals;

8) concentrating on preventive health rather than pure disease-orientation.

Sanitation - Mr. Ralph Gunderson - At present, domestic farm workers are the only industrial group discriminated against in availability of toilet facilities. Existing legislation specifies that drinking water be provided in a sanitary manner in the field. The larger problems to upgrade housing and field sanitation for domestic workers involve, for their solution, financial considerations and personnel to adequately inspect and enforce. In 1963, a bill covering toilet and hand-washing facilities in the field was defeated; it is to be reintroduced. Mobile units for these facilities cost $600 per unit; it is hoped they can be available also on a rental basis.

A second point mentioned by Mr. Gunderson was that illness did result from the accumulative effects of pesticides (Study by State Department of Public Health in Stanislaus County).

Labor Contractor - Mr. Cipriano Gaeta - Growers want to comply with the laws. But many workers prefer not to use toilet or washing facilities, or comply with rules regarding water containers for drinking. More supervisory personnel is needed if laws are to be enforced. Problem besetting labor contractor is widespread pressure from growers, State government, and local government.

Farmer - Domer F. Power - The people under consideration are not migrant nor minority groups but low income families. The overriding factor in all these problems is economics. Any increase in health services ultimately effects the consumer; and every worker is a consumer. Education has many facets, including the individual's interest in and readiness to accept, as well as his personal set of values. Every individual has pride in accomplishment, but he must also accept responsibility for his lot in life.

In response to prior discussion of pesticides, Mr. Power observed that the beneficial value of pesticides is reflected in the quantity, quality and cost of many food items available to the buyer and the consumer.

What's Being Done in Our State: A Panel Report

Child Care Centers - Mr. John Weber - With supplemental Federal funds available through Social Welfare, child care centers are or may be established by the State Department of Education, emphasizing three aspects of care: education, health and nutrition. The provision of day care will enhance the availability of training services to families receiving Aid to Dependent Children. Centers offer compensatory education benefits such as language training in English.

Hospitals and Medical Care - M.S. Curtis, M.D. - Problems in supplying constant medical care are grounded in the itinerant nature of these people, their low incomes and local eligibility requirements. Recognition of these problems by growers, workers and the medical profession is beginning to stimulate attention to remedying this situation.

Public Health - Dr. Frank Brewer - Dr. Brewer described the diagnostic, therapeutic and preventive medical services now provided at two night clinics in Merced County. Educational programs are incorporated into clinical services for pregnancy, diabetes, nutrition and diet; classes are conducted to train teen-age girls as clinic health aides; a program is being developed to qualify adults as community health aides. A day care center will soon be available to these families, not funded with Federal or State money. A survey of housing in one section has produced new housing facilities for farm workers there.

Farm and Field Safety - Mr. Henry Bartell - Mr. Bartell described the services and education program for promoting safety measures for crop dusters and field workers presently performed by Kern County's Safety Council. A training program in cooperation with Industrial Safety teaches 4-H boys how to operate tractors.

Sanitation, Hygiene and Safety in the Home and Field: A Panel of Farm Workers (Mrs. Frank Garcia, Merced; Jerrel Whisnand, Strathmore; Elisandro Garcia, Contra Costa; Vera Salcido, Merced.)

A number of problems affecting the sanitation, hygiene and safety practices were revealed and some indication of need for remedy was expressed. These problems include:

1) poor sanitation practices and conditions both at home and in the field aggravate sickness among workers. (Diarrhea is particularly common, not unusual when considering the lack of toilet and hand-washing facilities, multiple use of drinking water container, prevalence of insects, flies, dirt and cockroaches.)

2) accidents to children who accompany their parents to the fields because of insufficient supervision available at home;

3) the limitation of medical care to emergency treatment only for workers ineligible for longer-term medical supervision;

4) need for money to provide an adequate diet during winter and slack employment periods. Surplus money must be used for travel expenses to new job sites, and perishable foods are difficult to transport;

5) difficulty in obtaining driver's license because of language barrier, ignorance of driving regulations;

6) inadequate housing, especially for large families. Need is great for more rooms, more beds, inside bathrooms with running hot and cold water;

7) school dropouts due to inability to keep up with other children. Family mobility and the need for older children to remain at home caring for younger ones intensify the situation;

8) inability of families to pay for day care centers, ignorance that they exist or can be utilized;

9) insufficient or no preventive health education in some counties;

10) lack of transportation to medical services, clinics, child health conferences, etc.;

11) language barrier when using medical services;

12) lack of immunization of infants and young children;

13) lack of information and knowledge of family planning;

14) negative reaction to dental health education and care because of its low priority on list of problems.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to major recommendations approved by the participants of the Health Study Group, supplemental recommendations were made by the sub-groups which convened to evaluate specific health needs.

The first three recommendations were given top priority.

In consideration of the overall health needs of all individuals and the special needs of the farm laborer and his family, the Study Group on Health therefore recommends:

1. that adequate housing be provided for farm workers and their families. Adequacy is defined to mean:
   a. housing of suitable sizes;
   b. equipped with basic sanitary facilities, toilets and running water.

   Adequate housing, stressed the farm laborer panelists themselves, is considered intrinsic to physical and emotional well-being.

2. that health education programs and health information services should be created and/or extended (i.e., community aid programs, where leadership is provided from within the farm worker community by persons who speak both languages). The importance of providing health education programs related to special needs and at an appropriate level is stressed, to emphasize the importance of preventive health services in seeking treatment for minor problems before they become major. Moreover, farm community participants stressed that health knowledge must necessarily precede utilization of health services.

3. that medical care services be made available, designed to meet the special health needs of mobile working families. The scope of medical care services should be flexible, through decentralized county hospital clinics offering preventive and therapeutic services, and if possible include a mechanism for prepayment health insurance. Medical care services should include health education and plans for data collection for evaluation.

4. that methods be developed to eliminate the residence eligibility requirements required for care in county hospitals. Under the present system, farm workers and their families who must follow the crops cannot obtain adequate medical attention through existing tax-supported facilities. A first need is to eliminate those eligibility requirements which inhibit obtaining prenatal and infant care.

5. that a study be made of the methods by which tax-supported facilities provide medical services to all low-income families. The present "waiting" policy is antithetical to the ultimate objective of community-wide medical care, adequate in quality and quantity, for all citizens. The study should in part indicate the relationship of residence requirements for county hospital services to trends of morbidity and mortality.

6. that basic sanitation facilities be provided in the field. Further, that the Conference support legislation for setting Statewide minimum standards of field sanitation, with provisions and funds for adequate enforcement.

7. that the Conference support the recommendations of the State Board of Health and the California Conference of Local Health Officers that Family Planning Services be developed in local health departments throughout California.

8. that the findings and recommendations of the Conference be widely disseminated as part of an intensified effort to create in the California citizenry a greater awareness of and concern for seasonal farm worker families and their situations.

9. that continuity of care be better coordinated from state to state as well as county to county by effective follow-up information-recording methods. (one technique: give each family copies of medical records for each member and a postcard to return when they resettle elsewhere; information can then be forwarded to the appropriate agency in the new community on specific health or related needs.)

10. that driver education be made available. Moreover, where necessary, provide group transportation to health services through grower or community resources.

11. that home management and maintenance counselling should be made available by volunteer professional and teaching consultants.

12. that supervision of small children be made available through day care centers or mobilized baby-sitting services.

REPORT OF STUDY GROUP: HOUSING

STUDY GROUP STAFF

Local Host:	Don Erkel, Bakersfield Office, State Division of Housing
Moderator:	Albert W. Noland, Jr., City Manager, City of Bakersfield
Recorder:	Mrs. John Stanton
Reporter:	Albert W. Noland, Jr., City Manager, City of Bakersfield
Room Coordinator:	Jack Manweiler

SUMMARY

The Study Group on Housing heard a number of papers stressing the importance of adequate housing to promote the dignity and well-being of the child. In addition, a tour of farm labor housing in the Bakersfield area was conducted.

The panel on Housing specified that the housing needs of California's low-income agricultural workers are critical and that immediate attention is required to relieve shortages of both standard, permanent and seasonal housing. These needs, it was indicated, will become more acute upon the discontinuance of Public Law 78.

Excerpts from remarks by
Perry Nethington, Assistant Chief
Division of Housing
California Department of Industrial Relations

Justice Douglas of the United States Supreme Court said:

> "Miserable and disreputable housing conditions may do more than spread disease and crime and immortality. They may also suffocate the spirit by reducing the people who live there to the status of cattle. They may indeed make living an almost insufferable burden. They may also be an ugly sore, a blight on the community which robs it of charm and which makes it a place from which men turn. The misery of housing may despoil a community as an open sewer may pollute a river."

Housing, more than any other aspect of community living, both influences and reflects the health, morals and happiness of a neighborhood.

The housing needs of California's agricultural workers have been the subject of continued state concern and limited State power for nearly 50 years--long enough to develop a workable program to alleviate the critical housing deficiencies existing.

No other occupation group has been the recipient of more study and less effective action, nor had its fortune more entangled in public policy to less advantage.

The recent survey made by Oliver McMillan for the State Division of Housing showed that:

Housing Conditions

More than 80 percent of the farm worker families lives in dwellings which violate standards of health, safety and comfort; nearly 65 percent of the dwellings occupied by general field workers were dilapidated or deteriorated. Pit privies still serve 33 percent of the dwellings occupied by general field workers; 30 percent of the dwellings had no bathing facilities and 25 percent lack even a kitchen sink with running water.

Ten percent of all dwelling units had no water supply at all, and in one extremely deficient community, 90 percent of the dwelling units obtained their water supply by hauling it several miles in pails and milk cans.

Twenty-one percent of all dwelling units had no sewage facility and disposed of household wastes directly on the ground. Thirty percent obtained water from a private well which, in most all instances, was located on a small lot within a few feet of a septic tank, cesspool, or privy. Although overall population density was probably lower than in the typical urban slum, crowding within units was high, with 49 percent of the farm worker family units sheltering more than 1.5 persons per room.

Twenty percent of all households shared toilet facilities; 11 percent shared baths.

Income

The median annual income of the average head of the family who is employed as a general field worker was found to be $2,207 with a median rental of $42 to $44 for a four to five room house; larger dwellings, if available, would be out of reach for the average farm worker and his family.

Sixty-three percent of the farm worker families were found to be living in three or less rooms.

The problem, is purely economic--LACK OF INCOME.

Most of us compete for housing in a market where home ownership is rapidly becoming impossible for families with incomes of $7,000 or less annually.

Agricultural workers compete for housing, but with incomes less than $3,000.

I leave to your imagination what kind of future a child has who must grow up under these conditions.

Obviously the ideal solution would be to increase the level of income of the farm worker so that he would be competitive with other occupational groups; even if it were possible to double the income of the agricultural worker he would still have difficulty competing for housing.

The agricultural worker remains, as he has since the State's early transition to intensive labor-use farming, among the most poorly paid, poorly fed, and poorly housed of California's citizens.

Employer-Provided Housing

The Labor Camp Act does not require the employer to provide housing. It does require, however, that if housing is provided, it must meet certain minimum standards of health and safety.

In the Division of Housing's activities, a large section is the enforcement of the Labor Camp Act. The results have been positive, conditions have been improved in housing provided by the employer. However, the overall housing needs of the agricultural worker are as yet unmet.

Our records indicate that there are perhaps 15,000 to 16,000 employer-provided housing units for families, no more than ten percent of the average hired domestic work force of approximately 244,000.

The housing industry cannot meet the problem without an effective program for financing, in the form of direct subsidies or grants, and long term low-interest loans, made to individuals, farmers or non-profit corporations.

Whatever the program, it must meet all the needs. It must be flexible. It must insure minimums for health and safety. It must provide free choice as to type, size and location.

There is a need and a place for public-assisted rental housing, private ownership rental, private ownership with public assistance financing, cooperative, and mobile housing with financing made available to both individual and farmers.

One partial solution might be for farmers or grower associations to make land available in proper locations, not suitable for agricultural development to individuals or non-profit corporations for home construction. This would surely mean a considerable savings in overall construction costs.

Progress

I want to pay special tribute to the fine work being carried on by the American Friends Service Committee, to Bard McAllister and Howard Washburn in the self-help program. As a result of their efforts and financing through the Farmers Home Administration, three families have moved from substandard shacks into new homes in Goshen and two more homes are under construction. Plans are under way for six more houses in Tulare and Cutler.

Applications have been made to Farmers Home Administration for a $2 million project for 200 individual units in Merced County. Articles of incorporation and bylaws are being prepared. Two groups in Gilroy are talking about an estimated 50 units and the Housing Authority in Soledad has also been in contact with the Farmers Home Administration.

Progress is being made in Three Rocks through the fine cooperation of Federal, State and County authorities, private organizations, and public-spirited individuals.

Fourteen of the 50 substandard shacks have been removed. A Fresno County farmer has made 20 acres available for relocation of the remaining buildings, and the Rosenberg Foundation has approved a grant to pay the cost of supervision and construction of new dwelling units.

The housing authorities of Butte and Tulare Counties and the City of Wasco have requests pending for demonstration grant funds for 60 units.

The City of Fresno has filed application for $430,000 in Federal funds for the development of a 12½ acre labor center in West Fresno.

San Joaquin County, one of the first counties to initiate a housing program in fringe areas, inspected 261 family family units, posted 50, demolished 31, rebuilt 18, and 162 are in the process of being rebuilt.

This is a START, but it is NOT ENOUGH.

Responsibility

There are those who would say it is wholly an employer's responsibility. Some say it is the worker's responsibility, others say it is a public responsibility. It is a joint responsibility--yours and mine--Federal, State, local community, employer and employee, for no single solution, nor single type of housing serve the needs of all the agricultural workers, unskilled member of racial minorities or the elderly, for they too are the forgotten people of our prosperity. The same extensive housing deficiencies and characteristics of low income groups are common and these same collective deficiencies indicate the community environment.

Housing is more than packing crates nailed together and lined with cardboard boxes--more than a tent on a ditch bank or a dusty field--housing is more than a mere shelter.

Decent housing is a home structurally sound to withstand wind, rain, cold, and heat. It is a home with hot and cold water, adequate plumbing, bathing facilities, a rug, curtains, pictures, a green lawn and flowers in the garden. Housing is a place of warmth where the child can and will point with pride and say "This is where I live; won't you please come in."

This is the human side. When our objective becomes a reality we will have achieved dignity for the child.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Study Group on Housing concurred generally with the findings and recommendations of the previous Conference Study Group on Housing. As no drastic improvements in housing for farm labor families have been forthcoming in that interim, the Study Group reinforces these original recommendations which dealt with both the conceptual attitudes and specific standards to be met in giving the farm labor force safe, sound housing.

Therefore, the Study Group on Housing recommends:

1. support of the Governor's proposal on establishing the State Department of Housing and Community Development.
2. coordination of the State housing program with Federal and local, existing and new or proposed programs, both public and private.
3. that serious study be given to Article 34 of the State Constitution* which has proven detrimental to the development of effective public housing programs.
4. that consideration be given to provide public land grants for construction of agricultural housing.
5. the findings of the State Division of Housing and the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing should be considered.

And further, recognizing that a distinction should be made between the needs for permanent, home-base, off-farm housing and temporary, on-base housing, the study Group on Housing particularly recommends:

6. development of a public program to finance the construction of low cost privately owned and low rental housing for low income agricultural workers. Recognizing that public credit is the key to cheap and ample mortgage funds and that existing Federal programs do not meet all the need in this area of concern, major consideration should be given to the feasibility of tending State or other mortgage money either directly or at cost for extended periods of time. This money should be made available to agricultural workers, and public housing authorities.

In development of this program, we suggest consideration of:

   a. limited dividend housing;

---

*Provides that no low rent public housing project can be developed until the majority of qualified voters in a city, town or county has voted upon such issue.

   b. housing by redevelopment companies;

   c. conversion of projects into cooperative or private ownership;

   d. mortgage corporation financing;

   e. extension of credit for purchase of individual mobile homes or development of mobile housing centers;

   f. provision of technical assistance to individuals and groups prior to and during construction;

   g. collateral other than real property, including borrower's labor, should be recognized in extending credit.

7. development of a public program to finance construction of public facilities such as water and sewer systems where their addition would rehabilitate substandard communities.

8. in all construction, that the same minimum standards placed on sub-divisions be applied to new or remodeled housing for farm laborers, and that streets, lights, water and sewage be systematically planned.

9. development of a program to replace substandard housing at the existing farm labor centers, operated by housing authorities with adequate and approved housing for families engaged in seasonal farm work, and the possible construction of additional facilities in areas where labor needs and crop patterns indicate such facilities are needed.

10. with respect to the upgrading of substandard housing, that a realistic approach be taken by enforcement agencies. Study should be made regarding the advisability of the reimbursement of owners of condemned housing for their lost equity, particularly in the case of private owners.

11. that long-term, low-cost credit be extended for improvement of existing and new housing construction for agricultural workers.

REPORT OF STUDY GROUP: SOCIAL SERVICES

STUDY GROUP STAFF

Local Host:	Frances McFeely, Training Officer, Kern County Welfare Department
Moderator:	William Flynn, Chief, Child Welfare Services, Tulare County Welfare Department
Recorder:	Juanita Miller, District Representative, State Department of Social Welfare
Reporter:	William Flynn, Chief, Child Welfare Services, Tulare County Welfare Department

SUMMARY

The study group on Social Services concentrated on defining the role of social services as they influence the well-being of the seasonal farm worker and his family. Further, the application of specific social mechanisms adapted to aid these individuals was discussed and documented.

Social services is defined to mean: those services extended to persons in a dependent positon of social, economic, psychological or physical nature.

The total person must be appraised when considering how best to assist him; this enables each dollar expended to be stretched as far and as effectively as possible. Social services, like other aids, must be integrated, rather than fragmented.

The real impetus of social behavior and change lies in the family. Here, then, is where social services must be concentrated. Today, the social worker is consulted only when problems arise--desertion, divorce, delinquency, all of which must originate in family irritation. Today's social worker must study the whole family complex: their economic status, educational levels, health needs, psychological needs of parents and children.

Among the brief concepts and needs reviewed in the study groups were: the need for people to be self-supporting; the need for literacy training; the need for on-the-job and vocational training.

One fundamental observation is that the year-round unemployment problem is not one to be faced by the farm worker and his family alone; it is a community problem. The participants, therefore, strongly urge that the industry, the welfare department, the farmer and the worker unite to program adequate work to give the typical worker as much total annual employment as possible. And, because this may mean a diminuation of actual farm laborers needed, that social workers motivate and redirect individuals into obtaining other skills where they can be more securely guaranteed full year-round employment. As farm work is essential, coordinated community effort is essential to stabilize workers who like to work and to help families become an active part of the community.

In any program planning, therefore, it is important to include the seasonal worker himself. The Child Care Center movement, for example, which is so badly needed in rural areas, should not only consider the representation of the seasonal worker family but respond to their needs, bringing such centers closer to the camps where these children need attention. A further suggestion was made that a team composed of health and welfare services go to the camps to provide direct services to these families.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Study Group on Social Services appraised the importance of structuring social services flexibly to meet the particular needs of the farm labor family who must travel, unable to always benefit from existing social services. They reached concurrence on a number of policies and procedures, and therefore, the Study Group on Social Services recommends:

1. that the survey proposed to the Governor by California Agriculture (State Board of Agriculture, February 17, 1964) be supported by the public, and that consideration be given to a thorough survey of continued services and needs of migrant farm laborers based on its findings.

2. that better understanding of welfare programs can be achieved by establishing local citizens committees to interpret, publicize and implement welfare services and programs, leadership to be provided by the county welfare departments and the State Department of Social Welfare.

3. that the State Legislature repeal the residence requirements for welfare and health services, and investigate subsidies of matching funds for redistribution, so that funds are available on a per capita basis, not by county allotment.

4. that day care facilities be made available to pre-school and school age children of migrant families, such facilities to be accessible and geared to the working hours and wages of the families.

5. that vocational and recreational services be developed for the pre-teen and teenage children of migrant families. If such services already exist in a community, that they be extended to migrant farm families.

APPENDIX I

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CALIFORNIA CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES WHO FOLLOW THE CROPS

The history of the California Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops and its origins is composed of many threads. Each participant can narrate a personal story which would shed light on why the Conference has evolved and been sustaining.

The common thread has been the sound inter-group relationships between the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth and the many other co-sponsors who have helped shape the Conference programs.

The first Conference was held in Fresno, March, 1959. It was a joint venture of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth, the Sub-Committee on the Migrant Child working closely with a local group, the Fresno Rural Health and Education Committee. In Fresno there was a well-established relationship between the growers, the Health Department, the Agricultural Extension Service, the American Red Cross, the school system, the housing authority and the camp public health committees composed of indigenous leaders among the farm workers living in the labor camps. This cross-section of participants having knowledge of the farm worker and his family gave great vitality to this first Conference. There were too few farmers, despite efforts of the Chairman, Tom O'Neill. Many farm workers were unable to attend for lack of funds.

A varied group of speakers addressed this first meeting: Dr. Varden Fuller, Joe Brosmer, Dr. Benjamin Packer, Dr. Austin Matthis, Anna Price Garner, Rev. Douglas Still, Edward Dutton, Bard McAllister and Don Howard, Chairman of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth. Frank Potter of Washington, D.C., represented the President's Committee on Migratory Labor.

At the brief business meeting, a steering committee was created with the objectives:

1. to study the health, educational, spiritual and economic problems of the seasonal farm worker and his family.

2. to function as a medium through which information can be exchanged.

3. to call various types of Conferences to deal with the problem as a whole or any of its aspects.

4. to stimulate cooperation between the various groups and agencies concerned toward alleviation of the difficulties faced by the seasonal farm worker and his family.

Liaison between the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth and the steering committee was achieved through Mrs. Wyckoff, who served as Chairman of the latter group and also Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Migrant Child of the Governor's Advisory group. Subsequently, all members of the Sub-Committee on the Migrant Child were added to the steering committee.

Four follow-up local Conferences were held in 1960 in Santa Clara, Kings-Tulare, Kern and San Joaquin Counties. Rising interest was generated among the action groups: California Farm Bureau Federation, the Congress of Parents and Teachers, the American Public Health Association, the American Federation of Labor, the Community Service Organization. The Governor requested Dr. Malcolm H. Merrill, Director of Public Health, to appoint a Task Force to study the health of farm workers and their families. Dr. Bruce Jessup directed this study.

The second Conference was held in San Jose, October 24-25, 1960, again vigorously supported by local committees. A greater effort was made to draw more farmers and farm workers into the Conference; while the Farm Bureau and several unions were well represented, the absence of scholarships prevented many farm workers from attending. The group of co-sponsors was greatly enlarged, and greater involvement was achieved in program planning.

This Conference focussed primarily on health. In a "Doctors Meet the Press" program, three science editors of nearby newspapers interviewed Dr. Jessup of the Stanford Medical School, Dr. Paul O'Rourke, Health Officer of Imperial County, and Dr. Robb Smith, Rural Health Chairman of the California Medical Association on the findings of the Task Force Health Report. A number of distinguished speakers appeared at this Conference, including U.S. Senator Harrison Williams, Dr. James Shafer of the United States Public Health Service, State Welfare Director John Wedemeyer, State Agriculture Director William Warne, and Monsignor William J. Quinn of the Bishop's Committee for Migrant Workers. Discussion was lively and invigorating, and participant evaluation after the Conference indicated interest in a third Conference, support of local conferences and the continuance of the steering committee.

During the next year, many things began to happen among the action-oriented groups. The California Farm Bureau Federation arranged 18 county meetings devoted to health, bringing together Farm Bureau members, the County Health Officer, the County Hospital Director, public health nurses and other county officials concerned with health needs. The Congress of Parents and Teachers, the California Farm Bureau and other groups supported a bill introduced by Senator Vergil O'Sullivan and Assemblyman Myron Frew: the Migrant Health Act of California. Dr. Jessup was appointed as the first administrator of the program, which provided a few night clinics and health services specially designed to reach the seasonal farm worker and his family. Kern County took the initiative in developing the Community Health Aide, an indigenous farm worker leader who serves as liaison between the workers and the source of official health services.

The Community Service Organization, labor and church groups and others united to secure inclusion of farm workers in the Disability Insurance Program. The California Farm Bureau Federation began efforts to provide health insurance for farm workers, and issued a farm workers health record jointly with the California Medical Association.

The third Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops was held in Visalia, March 1-2, 1962. Again, the number of co-sponsors increased, and the local committee bore the major responsibility for the Conference arrangements. Members of the Kings-Tulare Conference on the Seasonally Employed were especially helpful. This time, the Governor's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth received a grant from the Rosenberg Foundation to enable farm workers to attend in greater proportion. Of the 362 participants, 60 were growers, 44 were farm workers; this greatly enhanced the practical value of the discussion groups.

Dean Daniel Aldrich of the University of California School of Agriculture was the keynote speaker, followed by a long list of able and scholarly speakers at both the plenary and study group sessions. It appeared, from the evaluation afterwards, that fewer speeches and more discussion would be desirable at future Conferences.

The participants were asked to evaluate the sessions and there was almost unanimous expression that there should be a Fourth Annual Conference. As one farmer put it: These problems did not come about in a short period. Three or four or six conferences may not solve them all. However, through amicable discussions we may be able to eliminate them one by one."

Dr. Eric Thor, Economist, Giannini Foundation said it this way:

> "Ten years ago the growers and the farm workers wouldn't even sit in the same room. Five years ago they were able to sit in the same room but on opposite sides. Now they mix around and chat with each other. So we really are making progress in communication."

A farm worker said after the first session:

> "Well, I have learned that this grower isn't a monster and he has learned that I am not a wino."

The principal value of the Conference now appears to be the substantial involvement of all parties concerned in planning a Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops--and to make sure of an adequate representation of farm workers and farmers from the very start.

APPENDIX II
PARTICIPANTS

FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES WHO FOLLOW THE CROPS

NAME	ADDRESS
Hector F. Abeytia	508 Tait, Sangor, California
C.S. Adams	12100 W. Barstow Avenue, Fresno, California
Mrs. Robert T. Adams	3146 Maryola Court, Lafayette, California
Raul M. Aguilar	2271 E. Washington, Stockton, California
Alta C. Alexander	USDA, Room 344, 630 Sansome Street, San Francisco
Mrs. C.V. Allason	424 N. Sanders, Ridgecrest, California
Dora C. Almaguer	317 A East Cook Street, Santa Maria, California
Anita Arciniega	901 "E" Street, Wasco, California
Roberto Arispe	P.O. Box 263, Goshen, California
Alice Arreola	30711 Burbank Street, Shafter, California
Wesley Ash	Div. Corrections, Rm. 502, State Office Bldg. #1, Sacramento, California
Ray Auker	402 Crocker Citizen, Fresno, California
Al Austin	Bakersfield College, 1801 Panorama Dr., Bakersfield
Stan Awenius	Box 380, Bakersfield, California
Mrs. Dewey Axtell	7th Dist. PTA, 2204 - 24th St., Bakersfield, Calif.
J.D. Axtell	2001 Dean Avenue, Bakersfield, California
Milton Babitz	721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California
Emerson M. Bain	Tranquillity, California (Box 8)
Roberta Esther Baker	906 Del Mar, Apt. 8, San Jose, California
Donald J. Ballinger	149 W. North Avenue, Fresno, California
Carlos Banales	618 Orchard Street, Bakersfield, California
Eva Barnes	100 Olive Avenue, Visalia, California
Grant A. Barnes	Conference Dept., Univ. Extension, Berkeley, Calif.
Henry J. Bartell	2001 Calloway Drive, Bakersfield, California
Twila Bartlett	Woodland, California
Virginia C. Bellinger	2015 Roosevelt Street, Bakersfield, California
Ben T. Lopez	9 Pesante Road, Salinas, California
Mrs. Guadalupe Benavides	Route 2, Box 575 (Hwy. 101) Morgan Hill, Calif.
Philip G.H. Benzenberg	P.O. Box 231, Visalia, California
Rev. H.J. Beutler, C.M.	529 "I" Street, Patterson, California
Rev. Bennie Chester Blair	515 South Owen St., Bakersfield, California
Harry E. Blair	2810 - 18th Street, Bakersfield, California
Jeanne Blanchard	Box 962, Santa Cruz, California
Jeanne Bolt	1122 Lomita, Bakersfield, California
Laura E. Bolt	1620 Camino Sierra, Bakersfield, California
Luada Boswell	3937 West 8th St., Los Angeles, California
A. Frank Brewer, M.D.	2212 "U" Street, Merced, California
Thomas M. Brigham	Fresno State College, Fresno, California
Mrs. Clifford Bright	7th Dist. PTA, 2204 - 24th St., Bakersfield, Calif.
C.Z. Brown	630 Sansome Street, San Francisco, California

Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops - List of Participants -

Walter W. Brown	P.O. Box 360-A, Santa Clara, California
DeWitte T. Boyd, M.D.	1617 Alta Vista Drive, Bakersfield, Calif.
Carl Boeman	225 Chester Avenue, Room 218, Bakersfield, Calif.
Virginia Brown	Bakersfield College, 1801 Panorama Dr., Bakersfield
Antonia Beltran	30715 Martinez Street, Shafter, California
Glenn E. Brockway	Office 734, 630 Sansome St., San Francisco, Calif.
Robert G. Bull	447 Federal Office Bldg., San Francisco, Calif.
David Burciaga	2701 Dartmouth, Bakersfield, California
Feliciano A. Burciaga	1643 South California, Stockton, California
Bruce Burkdoll	12167 Avenue 400, Cutler, California
Rev. Ronald A. Burke	11 First Street, Gilroy, California
Charlotte C. Buslaff	P.O. Box 791, Bakersfield, California
Refugio M. Cabello	725 Whipple Road, Union City, California
Walter T. Caldwell	2113 Haddon Avenue, Modesto, California
Miss Patricia Calmers	2233 - 11th Avenue, Sacramento, California
Manuel O. Canez	972 Primrose Avenue, Lamont, California
Elizabeth K. Canfield	Box 2111, South Station, Van Nuys, California
John Canning	6051 Niles Street, Bakersfield, California
Jerry Lee Cappello	2330 Bank Street, Bakersfield, California
Miss Georgiana Carden	San Francisco, California
Arthur G. Carlson	190 W. Dovewood, Fresno, California
Alice Carpenter	Lamont, California
Roberta Carter	Bakersfield College, 1801 Panorama Dr., Bakersfield
Melba J. Cather	930 South Tacoma Ave., Tacoma 2, Washington
Dorothy K. Castiglione	727 N. Highland, Visalia, California
Gloria V. Castaneda	P.O. Box 272, Goshen, California
John B. Castiglione	222 W. Willow, Visalia, California
Ugo Cavaiani	12640 First Avenue N., Ballico, California
George L. Chamberlin	Kern County Land Co., 2920 "H" St., Bakersfield
Mrs. Jackson W. Chance	210 Post Street, Rm. 911, San Francisco, Calif. 94108
Robert A. Chapman	2122 Mono Street, Fresno, California
Irene Chauvin	3106 N.E. 11th, Portland, Oregon
Florence Clifton	17261 Sunderland Drive, Granada Hills, California
G.L. Christiansen	Indio, California
Florence M. Christie	Route 4, Box 392, Bakersfield, California
Lyle M. Clayton	Box 1031, Tehachapi, California
Clifton Clemens	1390 Sunset, Wasco, California
LaVerne Codoni	Box 98, Empire, California
Rae J. Codoni	Box 98, Empire, California
Agatha Marie Cohee	408 W. 135th Street, Hawthorne, California
Phyllis A. Cohn	1444 Seventh Avenue, San Francisco, California
Maybelle D. Cook	917 Acacia, Bakersfield, California
Jack B. Collins	693 Sutter Street, San Francisco 2, California
Frank Contreras	Wasco, California
Rev. Melvin V. Cowan	P.O. Box 278, Parlier, California
Violet B. Cowan	431 Adams Street, Bakersfield, California
Mrs. Gerald Cox (Dorothy)	105 Mae Street, Ukiah, California
Don Craib	Kern County Welfare Department, 1115 - 26th Street Bakersfield, California

Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops - List of Participants -

Carl Morris Creeks	P.O. Box 126, Porterville, California
Mahard C. Crowder	P.O. Box 415, Wasco, California
Glena Crumal	127 Madden, Tulare, California
Duane O. Crummett, Ph.D.	11436 Berwick Street, Los Angeles 49, California
Mark Sears Curtis	1830 Flower Street, Bakersfield, California
O.J. Curtis	31962 Road 168, Visalia, California
Drexler Dana	604 Cherry Hills Drive, Kern City, California
Wilbur LaVerne Davis	1090 E. Valencia, Lindsay, California
Norman J. DeGrace	107 South Broadway, Los Angeles, California
Clementine Delouth	3406 Madison, Bakersfield, California
Wille E. Delouth	3406 Madison, Bakersfield, California
Jim Dickey	San Jose Mercury, San Jose, California
Joanne Myrtle Dietiker	10420 Myrtle Avenue, Lamont, California
Mary Diran	1722 Walnut Street, Berkeley, California
Lester L. Downing	California Dept. of Employment, 800 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814
Sylvia A. Dobrow	2447 Calhoun Way, Stockton, California
Mihail W. Dumbeliuk-Czernowicky	1412 Newport Way, Seattle, Washington 98122
James L. Drake	30664 Road 64, Goshen, California
Robert L. Dunbar	1403 Ordway Street, Berkeley, California
Walter W. Duncan	698 N. Lovekin, Blythe, California
John N. Dungan	P.O. Box 224 Exeter, California
Katherine Dungan	P.O. Box 224, Exeter, California
G.L. Dunnahoo, M.D.	Box 962, Santa Cruz, California
James Edwin Dunn, Jr.	4737 Dunn Road, Modesto, California
Oliver J. Duval	2020 Milvia Street, Berkeley, California
Edward Parker Dutton	2453 Prince Street, Berkeley, California
A.J. Edinger	145 S. American Street, Stockton, California
Mrs. G.D. Edwards	826 Madison Avenue, San Diego, California
Maria Elena	1736 Burton Way, Bakersfield, California
Jesse Daniel Eller	Box 742, Tulare, California
Gerhard W. Engelhardt	10420 Myrtle Avenue, Lamont, California
Jack T. Erikson	1300 Baker Street, Bakersfield, California
Don A. Erkel	225 Chester Avenue, Bakersfield, California
Julia G. Escalante	128 Stone Avenue, Shafter, California
Walt Fahrney	118 South "E" Street, Exeter, California
Roy F. Fast	Route 4, Box 359, Bakersfield, California
Ruth J. Fifield	155 South 11th, El Centro, California 92243
Roea A. Figueroa	c/o V.D. Section, James Lovegren, Health Education Consultant, California State Health Dept. 2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley 4, California
Marguerite R. Finley	280 Margarita Drive, San Rafael, California
Grace K. Finnegan	California State Health Dept., 2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley, California
John Fisher	Chico State College, Chico, California
William J. Flynn	2722 East Westcott, Visalia, California
E.M. Foster	13 Columbus, Bakersfield, California
Lowell E. Fowler	911 - 20th Street, Bakersfield, California

Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops - List of Participants

Howard T. Frazier	1322 Central Avenue, San Carlos, California
Constance Ann Freydig	P.O. Box 1350, Merced, California
Donald H. Fritts	Bakersfield Californian, Bakersfield, Calif.
Varden Fuller	207 Giannini Hall, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, Calif.

Cipriano N. Gaeta	2209 Second Street, Wasco, California
Sally Galaviz	Wasco, California
Mrs. Carmen Galvon	Route 2, Box 169-A Lena Avenue, Gilroy, Calif.
Henry E. Gammel	3983 N. Howard Avenue, Kerman, California
Margaret O. Gannon	251 Panorama Drive, Bakersfield, California
Gene Gonzales	1135 Wilcox Avenue, Monterey Park, Calif.
Consuelo Garcia	549 - 6th Street, Wasco, California
Bernice Gartung	15276 Road 208, Porterville, California
Dolores Garza-Pena	2304 Grant Street, Apt. E, Berkeley, Calif.
Vernon Larry Genesy	2109 Circle Drive, Corcoran, California
Dena Gerry	Box 962, Santa Cruz, California
Hermann J. Gerdts	46 S. Central Avenue, Campbell, California
Arnold Gilbert	46 Johnstone Drive, San Francisco, California
Dorothy Y. Goble	14634 Nelson Court, San Jose, California
Wendy P. Goepel	1785 Spruce Street, Apt. 3, Berkeley, Calif.
Catherine F. Gonzales	8204 Bernard Avenue, Lamont, California
Natalia Gonzales	11012 Santa Ana, Lamont, California
Carrol W. Goss	8000 Segrue, Lamont, California
Paul Gouviea	Kern County Welfare Dept., 1115-26th St., Bakersfield
Jessica Govea	118 "O" Street, Bakersfield, California
Margaret Govea	118 "O" Street, Bakersfield, California
Herman Grabow	2101 Stockton Blvd., Sacramento 17, Calif.
Daniel A. Grabski, M.D.	1103 "Q" Street, Bakersfield, California
Mrs. Allan Grant	10424 Avenue 320, Visalia, California
Allan Grant	10424 Avenue 320, Visalia, California
Albin J. Gruhn	995 Market Street, San Francisco, California
Catherine J. Grassley	1914 Fulton Street, Fresno, California
Bill Gruenhagen	2600 - 7th Street, Berkeley, California
Ralph V. Gunderson	624 Erma Street, Stockton, California
Emma E. Gunterman	Route 1, Box 746, Gridley, California
Joseph F. Gunterman	Route 1, Box 746, Gridley, California
J.R. Gwinn	Calif. Packing Corp., Merced, California

Bobbie J. Hammond	1821 Sycamore, Wasco, California
Dorothy G. Hansen	Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, California
Shirley Kathleen Harrington	6901 Norris Road, Bakersfield, California
Wayne Harbert	1309 Aspen Pl., Davis, California
Allen C. Hardoson	P.O. Box 217, Corona, California
Mrs. T.C. Harris	465 N. Central, Stockton, California
Anne Harrison	1710 Bell Avenue, Corcoran, California
Wayne Clyde Hartmire	3330 W. Adams Blvd., Los Angeles 18, Calif.
Borghild O. Haugen	740 Hilmar Street, Santa Clara, California
David W. Haven	209 West Oak, Visalia, California
Wilma S. Hawley	2740 E. Overholser, Fresno, California
Edward F. Hayes	Box 616, El Centro, California
James H. Hayes	Box 2062, Fresno, California

Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops - List of Participants

Diane Healy	Bakersfield College, 1801 Panorama Dr., Bakersfield
Alice M. Heath	317-A East Cook Street, Santa Maria, Calif.
Helen Heffernan	721 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California
Geoffrey V. Heller	CPS, 450 Mission St., San Francisco, Calif.
Mary Sophia Hernandez	8611 Bonita, Lamont, California
Cecil Edward Herrick	6296 St. Helena Hwy., Napa, California
Florence Herrick	6296 St. Helena Hwy., Napa, California
Beverley Hershey	Box 2111, Phoenix, Arizona
Bert Hendriksen	474 North San Pedro, San Jose, California
Patricia C. Hertert	Modesto Junior College, Modesto, California
Glenn I. Hildebrand	2715 Clemson Court, Bakersfield, California
Josephine Hiriart	Route 1, Box 102, McFarland, California
Arthur C. Hollister, Jr., M.D.	3320 Mildred Lane, Lafayette, California
Miss Lucille Hood	930 Roeder Way, Sacramento, California
Miss Susan Hopkins	1229 Naglee, San Jose, California
Jack Howard	Labor Dept., Washington, D.C.
Frank Howard	1401 "Q" Street, Sacramento, California
Doris Maude Hawes	3943 S. Lovers Lane, Visalia, California
Faust Hawes	3943 S. Lovers Lane, Visalia, California
Arley L. Howsden	Route 1, Box 412, Chico, California
Barbara Hoyt	1900 Spring Way, Bakersfield, California
Mildred M. Huber	721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California
Rev. William Cornelius Hughes	1105 North Lincoln St., Stockton, Calif.
William Hunt Conrad	600 California St., San Francisco, Calif.
Mary H. Hutchinson	1112 Filbert Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Julie Ann Iger	2712 - 20th Street, Bakersfield, California

Arthur M. Jenkins	P.O. Box 51, South Dos Palos, California
Tommy G. Jimenez	P.O. Box 178, Goshen, California
Irene I. Johnston	126 Afton, Salinas, California
Helen L. Johnston	4909 Bayard Blvd., Washington 16, D.C.
Clinton A. Jones	815 "G" Street, Reedley, California
Robert W. Jones III	330 Independence Avenue, Washington, D.C.
Harriet D. Jowett	2314 Mariposa, Fresno, California

Barry Karlin	940 Water St., Apt. 1, Bakersfield, Calif.
Audrey Kaslow	322 W. First Street, Los Angeles, California
Raymond E. Kaufman, M.D.	Box 2111, Phoenix, Arizona
Ardelle Keating	161 W. Alameda, Tucson, Arizona
Patricia Ann Kelley	P.O. Box 296, Fellows, California
Penny Kellogg	Bakersfield College, 1801 Panorama Dr., Bakersfield
Clarence A. Kempter	Social Sec. Admin., 2619 "F" St., Bakersfield
Elton Kessel, M.D.	Court House, McMinnville, Oregon
Glen W. Kent	P.O. Box 871, Martinez, California
H. Parley Kilburn	Bakersfield College, 1801 Panorama Dr., Bakersfield
Robert Seevers King	2855 Telegraph Ave., Berkeley, California
Jasper N. Knox, M.D.	4328 E. Clarendon Ave., Phoenix 18, Arizona
Martha Krigbaum	2639 Encina, Bakersfield, California
Ed Kushner	122 N. Rampart Blvd., #5, Los Angeles, Calif.

Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops - List of Participants

Nils F. Larson	12292 W. Barstow, Fresno, California
Thomas R. Larwood	2817 Idaho Street, Bakersfield, California
Doris E. Lauber	Children's Bureau, 447 Federal Office Building San Francisco, California
Allan Laursen	930 South Tacoma Avenue, Tacoma 2, Washington
Peters Lauwerys	304 S. Johnson Street, Visalia, California
Paul F. Lawrence	State Dept. of Education, Sacramento 14, Calif.
Floria Lee	169 W. North Avenue, Fresno, California
Tsun Hai Lee	1826 Morgan Lane, Bakersfield, California
Richard H. Lemmon	300 South Myrtle Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
Mrs. Margot Wakeman Lenhart	California Dept. of Employment, 800 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814
Russell L. Lewis	743 Union Street, Delano, California
Thomas N. Liggett	2444 Cedar, Bakersfield, California
Jim E. Like	21288 Avenue 200, Lindsay, California
Lester Lisker	4932 E. Olin, Fresno, California
William J. Little	Box 1478, Bakersfield, California
Lilia Little	Box 1478, Bakersfield, California
Alice Lomas	240 North "F" Street, Tulare, California
Leo R. Lopez	721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California
Mary Lopez	10004 Myrtle, Lamont, California
Coby Lorenzen	Univ. of Calif., Davis, California
Nadine Lucchesi	Bakersfield College, 1801 Panorama Dr., Bakersfield
Bard McAllister	417 North Kent, Visalia, California
Ernest G. McCabe	Los Angeles, California
Thomas A. McCullough	1145 Gilman Street, Berkeley, California
Paul A. McEwen	Exeter, California
M.B. McFarland, Jr.	P.O. Box 1458, McFarland, California
Virginia Louise McGrew	Box 65, Round Mountain, California
Mary C. McFarland	c/o No. Calif. Council of Churches, 83 McAllister Street, San Francisco, California
Rev. Jack McMichael	1625 N. Lincoln St., Stockton 4, California
Ed MacArthur	260 N. Fulton Fresno, California
Helen R. MacGregor	731 - 60th Street, Oakland, California
Theresa S. Mahler	135 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco 2, Calif.
Rose Mary Manfredi	1049 Bradshawe, Monterey Park, Calif.
Peter M. Manson	620 W. Paradise, Visalia, California
Jack Manweiler	Box 1478, Bakersfield, California
Jean V. Matergia	426 Echo Avenue, Fresno, California 93701
M. Louise Maupin	P.O. Box 475, Shafter, California
W. James Maynard	18571 Saugus Avenue, Santa Ana, California
James Mikels	1025 Chester Avenue, Fresno, California
Thomas H. Milby	2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley 4, California
Carl W. Miller	Kern County Health Dept., P.O. Box 997, Bakersfield, California
Hans A. Miller	P.O. Box 631, Yuba City, California
Jack Miller	3324 Wilshire, Los Angeles 5, California
Juanita Miller	647 Michettorena, Los Angeles, California
Lew Miller	2550 Mariposa, Fresno, California
Mrs. L.C. Milton	58 Duff Avenue, Reedley, California

Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops - List of Participants

Gordon W. Monfort	Box 627, Dinuba, California
Esther Montecino	Wasco, California
Connie Montemayor	Wasco Camp
Mrs. Gertrude T. Morris	5837 Chabot Road, Oakland 18, California
Marguerite Muckleston	P.O. Box 1707, Bakersfield, California
Dave Muller	11706 E. Keyes Road, Denair, California
Socorro Maria Munoz	602 - 4th Street, McFarland, California
Edward Warner Munson	P.O. Box 2137, Salinas, California
Bonney Murrell	Kern Co. Welfare Dept., 1115-26th St., Bakersfield
Richard L. Myer	1719 Quincy, Delano, California
Afton Dill Nance	721 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California
J.F. Neal	2917 South Fig Avenue, Fresno, California
Perry Nethington	P.O. Box 603, San Francisco, California
Victor Nichols	P.O. Box 746, Portier, California
Cleo Nielson	1201 Shattuck Avenue, Bakersfield, California
Jeanada H. Nolan	1321 - 40th Street, Sacramento 19, California
Andrew W. Oppman, Jr.	2203 State Capitol, Sacramento, California
William T. O'Rear	1055 N. Van Ness Avenue, Fresno, California
Edward W. O'Rourke	3801 Grand Ave., Des Moines, Iowa
Paul F. O'Rourke, M.D.	1316 Spruce Street, Berkeley, California
Jessie Ortega	30634 Ivy, Goshen, California
Gladys B. Osborne	1350 Catalpa Way, Bakersfield, California
Fred L. Ottoboni	California Dept. of Public Health, 2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley 4, California
Daniel Panger	928 Haight St., San Francisco, California
Rev. Russell A. Paulson	10429 Silver, Lamont, California
Mrs. Russell Paulson	10429 Silver St., Lamont, California
Hesther Poareo	1400 S.W. Fifth Ave., Portland, Oregon
Francis M. Paris	California State Health Department, 2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley 4, California
Ralph R. Parks	University of California, Davis, California
Eddie Perez	2780 East Gage Avenue, Huntington Park, Calif.
Ofelia Renteria Pena	P.O. Box 107, Goshen, California
Isabel A. Perez	317-A East Cook Street, Santa Maria, Calif.
M.L. Peterson	317 University Hall, U. of C., Berkeley, Calif.
Helen M. Phelan	46 Cutter Drive, Watsonville, California
Belle D. Poole, M.D.	State Health Department, 2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley 4, California
Dorothy J. Potts	1813 Shirlee Court, Bakersfield, California
Domer F. Power	Lindsay, California
Anand Prasad	Box 4253, Bakersfield, California
John L. Prueitt	1520 - 5th St., Wasco, California
Rev. Bruno E. Pueschel	638 Broadway, Wasco, California
Elvira R. Perez	909 "G" St., Wasco, California
Sylvia W. Ramsey	1108 Oleander, Bakersfield, California
Albert Ranjel	921 - 8th Street, Wasco, California
Eva Rasmussen	
Harry Rasmussen	
Raymond R. Reising	300 Carmelita Way, Porterville, California

Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops - List of Participants

Robert E. Reynolds	215 W. 7th Street, Room 430, Bartlett Bldg. Los Angeles 14, California
William C. Rice	145 Third Avenue, Yuma, Arizona
Tom E. Richardson	4213 Cowell Road, Concord, California
Don Riddle	15056 Johnson Drive, Orosi, California
Larry Riordan	4551 E. Cole Avenue, Clovis, California
Thomas E. Roberson	24 Farragut Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.
Comer A. Robertson	1817 North Cain Avenue, Visalia, Calif.
Frank P. Rodrigues	12625 Saratoga, Saratoga, California
Lea Mary Ramos	Lamont, California
Dolores Renteria	1025 "G" Street, Wasco, California
Earl Rouse	617 - 6th Street, Wasco, Calif. (City of Wasco Housing Authority)
Aldon Rose	Box 1478, Bakersfield, California
John Rose	Bakersfield College, 1801 Panorama Dr., Bakersfield, California
Sidney Rosin, M.D.	9735 Wilshire Blvd., Beverly Hills, California
Fred M. Roske	834 San Pedro St., Ventura, California
Violet Rotan	Strathmore, California
Raymond F. Roth	800 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California
Tony G. Rubinol	9813 Kenmore, Lamont, California
Carol M. Rugnao	9901 Elmco Avenue, Lamont, California
Dollie Russell	361 Eastwood Avenue, Lindsay, California
Mark Russell	361 Eastwood Avenue, Lindsay, California
Vera Salcido	Cal Pak #12, Planada, California
Timothy John Sampson	Avalon Community Center, 4272 Avalon Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90011
Lucille Sandberg	2521 Encina St., Apt. 4, Bakersfield, Calif.
Taylor Sandvigen	1400 S.W. Fifth Ave., Portland, Oregon
George M. Saunders	1700 Lincoln St., Randsburg, California
Earl Schauland	1114 Thomas Way, Delano, California
Thelma Schick	725 Page St., Lindsay, California
Cliff Schlegel	611 S. Catalina, Los Angeles, California
Albert Charles Selke	Children's Hospital, Los Angeles, California
Mildred A. Serrano	1005 Irwin Avenue, Fresno, California
Arthur H. Shaw	1901 Madison, Bakersfield, California
Margarita Shaw	Kern County Welfare Dept., 1115 - 26th St. Bakersfield
Mrs. Eva Shelford	1215 Maple Street, San Mateo, California
Rev. Paul Shelford	1215 Maple Street, San Mateo, California
Ferris R. Sherman	P.O. Box 791, Visalia, California
Mary Sierra	10805 Myrtle Street, Lamont, California
James S. Silva	410 Sherwood Drive, Brentwood, California
Walter Simcich	995 Market Street, San Francisco, California
Mr. Singleton	
Mrs. Singleton	
Marie Elizabeth Singleton	162 Coleridge Drive, Salinas, California
Burleigh Smith	KLYD-TV, 2831 "I" St., Bakersfield, Calif.

Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops - List of Participants

Margaret Fluetsch Smith	1552 W. 23rd Street, Merced, California
Neman Smith	805 E. Weber, Stockton, California
Robert L. Smith	29550 Madera Avenue, Shafter, California
Faustina Solis	337 Harvard Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94134
Hortencia Solis	3113 Fillmore, Bakersfield, California
John L. Soria	304 So. Johnson St., Visalia, California
A.D. Spomer	1316 North Alta, Dinuba, California
Bill Stanfield	U.P. Reporter, Fresno, California
Millicent Stanton	2017 Avondale, Bakersfield, California
Charles Leonard Starbuck	6503 Mt. Hood Drive, Bakersfield, California
James M. Stewart	195 Edgewater, Rio Vista, California
Mrs. Walter Stiern	7th Dist, PTA, Bakersfield, California
William H. Stockard	2805 Green Street, Merced, California
Eleanor Soloris Sierra	317 North Derby Street, Arvin, California
Edith B. Storey	727 Palm, Fresno, California
Klare B. Strange	7th Dist. PTA, 2204-24th St., Bakersfield, Calif.
Walter Stiern, State Senator	2901 Skyline Blvd., Bakersfield, California
A.D. Studybaker	630 Sansome St., Room 627, San Francisco 11, Calif.
Leonard E. Swenson	3208 Erie Avenue, Merced, California
Ernest K. Takahashi	309 S. Divisadero, Visalia, California
Helena F. Tavernetti	403 Crocker-Anglo Bank Bldg., Rm. 71 Hunter's Lane, Salinas, California
Greta LaVerne Taylor	24650 Shepardson Drive, Loma Linda, California
Stephen S. Taylor	945 W. Prospect, Visalia, California
William J. Thompson	Box 380, Bakersfield, California
William J. Tibbs	Children's Hospital, Los Angeles, California
Richard M. Towse	1101 Cedar, Wasco, California
John R. Trimble	18952 Avenue 144, Porterville, California
John Kollen Tritenbach	P.O. Box 158, Corcoran, California
Edward J. Valliere	City Hall, 1501 Truxtun, Bakersfield, California
Richard T. VanMetre, Jr.	SDSW, Bureau of Family Services, Sacramento
Loyal H. Vickers	22807 Barton Road, Colton, California
Eugene Arthur Vinckel	781 Robinson Drive, Merced, California
Mervyn R. Voth	2020 Sunset, Wasco, California
Loren H. Voth	450 "Q" Street, Wasco, California
Evelynne C. Walker	2276 W. Bullard, Fresno, California
George Walker	P.O. Box 3425, Poplar, California
Frankie W. Walker	P.O. Box 3425, Poplar, California
Henry Waller	PHA, 1360 Mission St., San Francisco, California
A.C. Walton	No. Ave. Comm. Center, Fresno, California
Howard Washburn	801 W. Walnut, Visalia, California
Harry E. Weatherholt	P.O. Box 380, Bakersfield, California
John R. Weber	3801 Woodcrest Road, Sacramento, California
Wallace B. Webster	104 North Stine Road, Bakersfield, California
Warren F. Wegis	2716 "L" Street, Bakersfield, California
Carroll D. Welch	141 Robertson, McFarland, California
David L. Westwater	Kern Co. Supt. of Schools Office, 1415 Truxtun, Bakersfield, California

Fourth Annual Conference on Families Who Follow the Crops - List of Participants

Thelma Bowles Whitehead	1302-B Quincy Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
Anita E. Wiggins	Bureau of Nursing, 2151 Berkeley Way, Berkeley 4, California
R. Ken Wilhelm	1652 Park Hills, Los Altos, California
Ray E. Williams	118 Elena Drive, Walnut Creek, California
J. Post Williams	Room 202, County Civic Center, Visalia, Calif.
Kirke Wilson	304 S. Johnson Street, Visalia, California
Margaret Ann Wilson	1903-B Oregon St., Bakersfield, California
Ruth M. Wilson	1407 Market Street, Rm. 400, San Francisco, Calif.
Verse H. Wilson	701 El Toro, Bakersfield, California
Edward E. Winn	731 North Hacienda Drive, La Habre, California
Lois B. Wood	905 Main Street, Watsonville, California
Mrs. Wilson W. Wood	9910 Oroville Highway, Marysville, California
Joan Wooters	920 South Spruce, Tulare, California
Mr. L.E. Wormley	Room 502, State Office Bldg., #1, Sacramento
Georgia Lee Wren	1720 South Maple Avenue, Fresno, California
Florence R. Wyckoff	243 Corralitos Road, Watsonville, California
Thomas Ellis Yarbrough	422 W. North Avenue, Fresno, California
Fred R. Young	47-094 Van Buren, Indio, California
Hector Zavaleta	2503 Sumac Avenue, Stockton, California

22003-450 5-64 4M OSP

ADDITIONAL COPIES

AVAILABLE BY WRITING:

Governor's Advisory Committee
on Children and Youth
401 State Building No. 1
Sacramento 14, California

STAFF

COVER DESIGN: Hazel Anderholm
EDITORIAL CONSULTANT: Devra Miller
PHOTOGRAPHER: Norman Breslow
SUPERVISION: Paul F. O'Rourke, M.D. & Robert Dunbar

TYPISTS: Mildred J. Jones & Jackie Claybrook
PRODUCTION: California State Printing Office